

THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

EDINBURGH :
PRINTED BY T. CONSTABLE, PRINTER TO HER MAJESTY.

THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

VOL. X.

EDINBURGH :
W. P. KENNEDY, SOUTH ST. ANDREW STREET;
LONDON : HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO. ;
DUBLIN : JAMES M'GLASHAN.

1849.

CONTENTS OF N° XX.

ART.	PAGE
I. 1. Trois Mois au Pouvoir. Par M. de Lamartine. Paris, 1848.	
2. Memoirs of Citizen Caussidière, Ex-Prefect of Police and Representative of the People. 2 vols. London, 1848.	
3. Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux. Par Emile Thomas Paris, 1848.	
4. La Revolution de Février au Luxembourg Par Louis Blanc. Paris, 1848.	
5. Qu'est-ce que la Propriété, ou, Recherches sur le Principe du Droit et du Gouvernement. Par P. J. Proudhon. Première édition, Paris, 1840 ; Nouvelle édition, Paris, 1848.	
6. Le Droit au Travail a l'Assemblée Nationale, Recueil Complet de tous les Discours prononcés dans cette Mémorable Discussion ; avec une Introduction et des Notes. Par M. Joseph Garnier. Paris, 1848.	
7. De la Propriété. Par M. A. Thiers Edition augmentée. Paris, 1848.	
8. Le Socialisme ; Droit au Travail, Réponse à M. Thiers Par Louis Blanc. Paris, 1848.	
9. Lettres sur l'Organization du Travail ; ou, Etudes sur les Principales Causes de la Misère. Par Michel Chevalier. Paris, 1848.	
10. Jérôme Paturot à la Recherche de la Meilleure des Républiques. Par Louis Reybaud. Paris, 1848. .	261
II. 1. The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, with Memoir by Sir Harris Nicolas. London, 1845.	

ART.

PAGE

II.—*continued.*

2. Cabinet Pictures of English Life—Chaucer. Knight's Weekly Vol. XXX.
3. Canterbury Tales. Do. do., Vols. LXXV. and CXIV.
4. Selections from the Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer. By Chas. D. Deshler, with a concise Life of the Poet, and Remarks illustrative of his Genius. London, 1847.
5. The Poems of Geoffrey Chaucer Modernized, with Life, by Professor Leonhard Schmitz. 1841.
6. Tales from Chaucer. By Charles Cowden Clarke. 1833.
7. The Riches of Chaucer. By Charles Cowden Clarke. London, 1835. 293

- III. 1. The History of Rome from the First Punic War to the Death of Constantine. By B. G. Niebuhr. In a Series of Lectures, including an Introductory Course on the Sources and Study of Roman History. Edited by Leonhard Schmitz, Ph. D. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1844.
2. Vorträge über Römische Geschichte, an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten. Von B. G. Niebuhr. 3 vols. 8vo. Berlin, 1846.
3. Lectures on the History of Rome, from the earliest Times to the Commencement of the First Punic War. By B. G. Niebuhr. Edited by Dr. M. Isler. Translated, with many additions, from MSS., by Dr. Leonhard Schmitz, F.R.S.E., Rector of the High School of Edinburgh. 8vo. London, 1848.
4. B. G. Niebuhr's Lectures on Roman History, delivered at the University of Bonn. From the Edition of Dr. M. Isler. Translated by Haviland Le M. Chepmell, M.A., and Franz C. F. Demmler, Ph. D. Vol. I., 8vo. London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, 1849. 329

- IV. Essay on the Union of Church and State. By Baptist Wriothoesley Noel, M.A. Pp. 681. London, 1848. 350

- V. The History of England, from the Accession of James II. By Thomas Babington Macaulay. In 2 vols. London, 1849. 1800 pp. 367

- VI. "Presbytery Examined;" An Essay, Critical and Historical, on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland since the Reformation. By the Duke of Argyll. 424

CONTENTS.

iii

ART.	PAGE
VII. Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell. Edited by William Beattie, M.D., one of his Executors. London, 1849.	459
VIII. Report from the Select Committee on Public Business, together with the Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix. Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 14th August 1848.	501



THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

FEBRUARY, 1849.

- ART. I.—1. *Trois Mois au Pouvoir.* Par M. de LAMARINE. Paris, 1848.
2. *Memoirs of Citizen Cossuillière, Ex-Prefect of Police and Representative of the People.* 2 vols. London, 1848.
3. *Histoire des Ateliers Nationaux.* Par ÉMILE THOMAS. Paris, 1848.
4. *La Révolution de Février au Luxembourg.* Par LOUIS BLANC. Paris, 1848.
5. *Qu'est-ce que la Propriété, ou, Recherches sur le Principe du Droit et du Gouvernement.* Par P. J. PROUDHON. Première édition, Paris, 1840; Nouvelle édition, Paris, 1848.
6. *Le Droit au Travail à l'Assemblée Nationale, Recueil Complet de tous les Discours prononcés dans cette Mémoireable Discussion; avec une Introduction et des Notes.* Par M. JOSEPH GARNIER. Paris, 1848.
7. *De la Propriété.* Par M. A. THIERS. Edition augmentée. Paris, 1848.
8. *Le Socialisme; Droit au Travail, Réponse à M. Thiers.* Par LOUIS BLANC. Paris, 1848.
9. *Lettres sur l'organisation du Travail; ou Etudes sur les Principales Causes de la Misère.* Par MICHEL CHEVALIER. Paris, 1848.
10. *Jérôme Paturot à la Recherche de la Meilleure des Républiques.* Par LOUIS REYBAUD. Paris, 1848.

At the moment that the dynasty of Louis-Philippe was overthrown, the sovereignty of France fell into the hands of the people of Paris. What use they were to make of the opportunity, what character they were to give to the Revolution that they had just effected, depended on the collective tenor at that

moment of their political prepossessions and wishes. What those prepossessions and wishes were, however, it has required subsequent events to make clear.

One thing, indeed, was decided from the very beginning. France was to be a Republic. Abolishing royalty, and accounting the events of the preceding fifty years as a mere interruption, in part splendid and in part disastrous, of the great career of self-government that had been begun in 1792, the French people were now to resume that career in a new spirit, and under better auspices. So much may be said to have been agreed upon from the first; it was virtually settled by the people in the streets, and if there were any dissentients, they were obliged to hide themselves. Another point also may be said to have been settled at the same time; namely, that the Republic thus revived was to be a Republic based on universal suffrage. To stop at a restricted system of suffrage, such as satisfied the men of the first Revolution, was doubtless impossible. At all events the attempt was not made.

A Republic, then, and a Republic based on universal suffrage, such was the lowest result that the people would accept from the Revolution of February. To this all classes were obliged to make up their minds, Louis-Philippists and Legitimists, Politicians and Bourgeoisie; and all that the more moderate spirits of the country could hope was, that by uniting their efforts they might be able to arrest the movement at this stage, and prevent it from going any farther.

To English readers, accustomed to regard a Republic, and, above all, a Republic based on universal suffrage, as a condition of things beyond which nothing else exists to be either desired or dreaded, these words "any farther" may appear strange. But when it is considered that the word Republic is only the name for a particular method of electing the governors of a country, and that it implies nothing as to the set of principles that shall prevail in the Government, except indeed a certain conformity at all times to the will of the majority, this wonder will vanish, and it will be seen how among Republicans themselves there may be differences of moderate and extreme. One class of persons, for example, may desire a Republic as an end, and for its own sake, that is from a mere general conviction that this is the likeliest form of Government to secure the prosperity of a nation; another class of persons may desire it rather as a means, in other words, from a conviction that, if this form of Government were established, then certain favourite theories that they are obliged in the meantime to keep in reserve, might be put in practice. It was precisely so in Paris on the 24th of February last. The effective Revolutionists of that day were

not a single compact body feeling together and moving together; they were a great straggling multitude, of which one battalion marched far in advance of the rest. One portion of them desired a Republic because they believed it would put an end to the corruption that existed, and secure better government for the future; but many desired it more expressly because they had predetermined in their own minds certain things that they would do when they had got it.

Of the moderate Republican party, desiring the Republic for its own sake, or at least for the sake of the general prospect of good that it held out, the natural leaders were Dupont de l'Éure, Arago, and other members of the small radical section in the old Chamber of Deputies. Their chief organ out of doors was the *National* newspaper, edited by Marrast. To them was attached the generous and high-souled Lamartine. If not a Republican before in the precise sense in which they had been Republicans, he had at least had democratic visions of his own; he had fought the battle of reform along with them, and had stood boldly when Barrot had flinched; and now that the hour of the Republic was come, he had been the first to close with it and lend it his voice.

Such was the Moderate Republican Party, the recognised and traditional Republicans of France, the successors and admirers of Armand Carrel, called from the position of a small minority of Parliamentary Radicals, to a supreme place in the eyes of the nation. To indicate the nature of their prepossessions and views, they may be called the Political Republicans, that is, the Republicans who having all along directed their efforts to the establishment of a Republic as an end, were willing, now that the end was gained, to wait for the response of the people. Very different from these were the Republicans that remain to be described. Confident that the Republic would come, but weary of waiting for it, they had turned their attention, in the meantime, by way of preparation, to certain deep social questions, the settlement of which, they believed, would form the first and principal business of the Republic whenever it should arrive. In the preliminary study of these questions, in the search beforehand for solutions or even approximate solutions to some of them, they were already, they believed, serving the future Republic, at the same time that they were procuring intellectual pleasure for themselves. "Let others," they said, "strive in the political arena to bring in the Republic; we will assist them when it is necessary to do so, but meanwhile we will rehearse our parts in an imaginary Republic of our own." These were the Social, or the Social and Democratic Republicans, that is, the Republicans who, in virtue of the zeal with which they had studied certain social changes that they thought would take place

in a Republic, had come to value the Republic itself chiefly as a means for bringing about those changes. They had kept their promise, indeed, of fighting for the Republic when the chance came, nay, they had fought with double ardour; but they had fought with doctrines in their heads, and, when the fight was over, they stood aloof from their companions and attempted to dictate. "You have done your part," they said, "in achieving the Republic; and now we will show you what to do with it." Let us examine a little more closely into the constitution of this party, and the nature of its tenets.

The grand peculiarity of the party consisted, as all know, in certain sanguine preconceptions that it entertained as to the possibility of a sudden amelioration of the condition of the working-classes.

The father of these new social speculations in their most general form was Saint-Simon. It was he who, more than thirty years before, had thrown forth the idea, since become familiar, that a great crisis of European society was at hand, when not only should industrial interests assume the preponderance in politics, but the industrial mind itself should seize the administration; it was he that had set the example to theorists of a certain class, by proposing his ideal of society as it should be,—an ideal which consisted in a supposed hierarchical arrangement of all the members on the one great principle, that every man should be stationed according to his capacity, and paid in proportion to his services; and it was from him also, or at least from his school, that had emanated the proposition, so subversive in its purpose, for reducing all men to an original equality of chances, by abolishing the law of inheritance. Many of the Saint-Simonians, it is true, had abandoned their attitude of hostility to the existing *régime*, and, retaining their doctrines only as speculations, had even taken office as public functionaries. Others, however, maintaining their character as members of a Church-militant, had joined the ranks of the democracy, adapting the Saint-Simonian creed for immediate service, and suiting portions of it to the popular taste. Of these the most eminent was Pierre Leroux, the founder of a philosophic sect called Humanitarians. His most distinguished pupil, and his assistant in the work of disseminating his peculiar democratic generalities among the people, was George Sand.

Tributary to this great stream of Saint-Simonian speculation, were the theories of the Fourierists. From them had emanated the doctrine of co-operation, as applied to industry; the idea of associating mankind universally into little communities, or phalanxes, by the operation of their natural inclinations and tastes, each community to form a united firm or copartnership of various

trades; drawing their provision from a common fund, and dividing the profits periodically among the members, according to the three categories of Labour, Capital, and Talent; labour to share as five, capital as four, and talent as three, in the distribution. In this scheme of the Fourierists, it will be observed, and particularly in its subordination of capital and talent to labour, there was, as compared with the scheme of the Saint-Simonians a decidedly levelling tendency, a decided tendency to assimilate human conditions, and make all men socially equal. And yet, in recognising capital and talent at all as entitled to consideration in the distribution of material advantages, Fourier clearly meant to uphold private property, and to assert some degree of social inequality to be necessary and inevitable. Still there was enough of absolute Chartism in the system to make it a powerful democratic engine; and, accordingly, among the democratic forces at work in France before the Revolution of February, may be reckoned the whole body of the Phalangsterians or Fourierists, represented in the press by the *Démocratie Pacifique*, and other journals, and headed in the public eye by Victor Considérant, their ablest man, and the ordained successor of Fourier. How little, however, the Fourierists were expecting the speedy arrival of the democratic epoch that they longed for, or how little they desired a social outbreak at all, is shown by the fact, that only a month or two before the Revolution, Considérant in dedicating (without permission) the third edition of his *Destinée Sociale* to Louis-Philippe, expressed a hope that the King himself might yet lay the foundation-stone of the first Phalangstère, and thereby win an honour for the dynasty of Orleans.

A more formidable contribution to the new democratic philosophy than either the magnificent generalities of the Saint-Simonians, or the impracticable schemes of the Fourierists, were the theories of the so-called Communists. The peculiarity of Communism, as compared with either Saint-Simonianism or Fourierism, consists in its total abrogation of all social inequality between man and man. Saint-Simonianism, we have seen, is almost an aristocratic creed: it proposes, indeed, a revolution in the present order of things, but the system of society that it would build up instead, would be a gorgeous hierarchy, of functions, spiritual and temporal, in form resembling the Catholic system of the Middle Ages, all authority proceeding from above downwards. Fourierism, on the other hand, would arrange mankind in corporations smaller and larger on a level platform, each corporation, from the smallest to the largest, delegating the powers of government upwards to officers chosen by itself. So far, therefore, it is more democratic, more republican in its spirit than Saint-Simonianism. Even Fourierism, however, re-

tains differences of rank and wealth, and stops short of absolute social equality. To both systems alike Communism says, No. Absolute and entire social equality, in other words, absolute and entire equality in respect of the material advantages of life, notwithstanding all the natural inequalities of health, strength, talent, virtue, and energy, that do subsist, and perhaps will ever continue to subsist, between man and man; this is essentially what Communism demands. It does not necessarily deny the natural inequalities that have been alluded to; it may or it may not hold these inequalities to be temporary and destined to gradual extinction as society advances; it does not even necessarily deny that they should exert an influence over the mass of human relations; but it maintains, at least, that any such influence ought to be confined to the feelings, to the purely moral relations between soul and soul, and ought to have no issue into the sphere of material things. All human beings, whatever they may be in the eye of the Infinite, are here but citizens of one common planet, crowded, as it were, upon a given weight of earth, and having at their disposal but the limited quantity of material products and comforts that they can extract out of it. Let these creatures of the Infinite regard each other as they choose—with love, admiration, dislike—all as their Infinite instincts guide them, soul recognising soul through the veil of the body; but let the inequality stop here; let not heaven and earth be commingled, and let not any man, in virtue of any advantages that he may possess in the sphere of the illimitable, claim, or be allowed to have, a larger interest than another in the limited fund of material wealth that is the property of all. Whatever may be the differences of value between man and man, regarded from the *supra-mundane* point of view, (which we assume when we exercise our affections,) in the society of this world, at least, and considered as a co-partnership of individuals associated to till and otherwise modify to their use a given extent of earth, all men are equally units.

Such, in its highest and most abstract form, seems to be the doctrine of Communism. In a vague sentimental shape we see it lying deep in the popular mind of all ages, producing usually only dumb discontent, but roused now and then, by the force of special misery, into something almost resembling a scientific expression.

“Alaboon, Sir Priest, Alaboon!

By your priesthood now give me to see;

Sir Galfred the knight, that liveth hard by,

Why should he be greater than me?”

Perhaps the first germ of the doctrine, in the modern shape in which it has been since developed, is to be found in the writ-

ings of Rousseau. "He that first inclosed a piece of land, and said, *This is mine*, and found people simple enough to believe it, was," says Rousseau, "the real founder of civil society. How many wars, crimes, and massacres—how many miseries and horrors would have been spared to the human race, had some one levelled the boundary, filled up the ditch, and said to his companions, 'Beware of this impostor; you are lost if you forget that the fruits belong to all, and the earth to no one.'" Among the anarchical expansions of this doctrine that sprang up about the time of the first French Revolution, the most remarkable was that of Gracchus Babeuf, who was guillotined in 1796, for an attempt to overthrow the Directory, and subvert the Republican Constitution then in force. Babeuf was the President of a club whose object it was to establish a true and absolute democracy, by means of an equal partition among all of the property monopolized by the few. The readiest way to effect this in any State, would be to confiscate all the property existing in it at any given moment, and portion it out in strictly equal divisions among the citizens: but the plan of Babeuf, as expounded after his death by his disciple and panegyrist, Buonarotti, was somewhat slower and more cautious. "To establish by the laws a public order, in which proprietors, while retaining provisionally their effects, should find neither abundance, nor pleasure, nor respect; where, forced to spend the greater part of their revenues in expenses of cultivation and in tolls, crushed by a weight of progressive taxation, set aside from public business, deprived of all influence, and forming in the State but a suspected class of foreigners, they should be at last forced to emigrate, leaving their goods behind them, or to seal with their own adhesion the establishment of universal community"—such was the scheme of Babeuf, as described by Buonarotti. In other words, the class of proprietors was to be extirpated, not at once, but by a process of gradual corrosion.

This class of Communists, frequently distinguished as the Babouvists, and sometimes also as the Equalitarians, or Equalitarian Communists, is all but extinct in France. The Communism now in vogue is of the species named Fraternal Communism, of which the chief expositor is M. Cabet, formerly Attorney-General under Louis-Philippe, and member of the Chamber of Deputies, and not long since an exile in England. In essence, the theory of Cabet is the same as that of Babeuf, namely, that all the members of society should share equally the material advantages at command; the difference between the two theorists being a difference rather of spirit and temper. Babeuf was an anarchist, a man of hard and desperate resources, ready for any amount of rigour necessary for the application of his

scheme. Cabet is a quiet dreamer, a man of inoffensive character and gentle demeanour, not at all logical or systematic in his ideas, but master of a simple and pleasing style, that seems to suit his audiences. In these respects, and in the boundless faith that he has in his own strange fancies, he appears very much to resemble his counterpart in this country, Robert Owen, who, as he walks in the streets of London, firmly believes, it is said, that in six months they are all to disappear. Cabet's chief production is a work entitled *Voyage en Icarie*, in which, under the convenient form of a fiction, he describes in rosy hues, his ideal of a society, reconstituted on the principle of equality. In this imaginary paradise, there is no money, no crushing commerce, no private capital; all labour equally with instruments and materials furnished by the state; and the results of the common industry are deposited in public magazines, for equal distribution among the citizens. The consequence is, that there is no want, no weariness, no discord; luxury such as no Eastern Nabob could command, is the lot of all in Icaria; all loll on sofas of the softest velvet, the dark-haired on sofas of crimson, the fair-haired on sofas of blue; all partake of the choicest viands at stated hours; all travel in first-class carriages; all are happy and serene—such, without a word of exaggeration, is Cabet's picture of society, as he hopes to make it. Yet, in prosecuting even this dreamy method of representing to himself what he would be at, he seems to have struck against certain obstacles; hence some limitations in his creed to the theory of absolute equality. The institution of the family, for example, is still to exist, a little monopoly of pleasures and duties. The partition of property, too, mathematical equality being impossible, is to proceed on a principle of only virtual or approximate equality, that may be thus expressed: "Each man, producing according to his faculties, is to be remunerated according to his wants." This rule of proportionality being observed, however, will in effect produce equality, for although the man of ravenous appetites will certainly according to such a rule receive most, yet, as the man of simple desires will have as much as he cares for, there will be no real inequality in the case. The fair-haired man may not have a crimson sofa like his dark friend, but then this will be because blue will suit him better.

Contenting himself with denouncing property and capital in general terms, and with affirming the abstract proposition, that the extinction of misery can be attained only by the extinction of opulence, Cabet made no direct attempt to subvert the existing order of things. The golden age, he believed, would roll in upon men unawares; and there was horror in all revolutionary courses. Only if one could exhibit to the world a model

society founded on the true principles, the example would doubtless be salutary. Accordingly, the chief immediate use that Cabet made of the Revolution of February, was to carry out a plan previously meditated, and ship off a body of his disciples to found an Icaria in Texas.

It is needless to point out how completely Communism, whether in the form of Babeuf or in that of Cabet, is opposed to Saint-Simonianism. Communism requires that the natural inequalities of men, if such exist, shall have no issue into the sphere of strictly social relations; Saint-Simonianism, on the other hand, will organize society in no other way than by the very mechanism of these inequalities. The formula of Communism, as propounded by Cabet, may be expressed thus:—"The duty of each is according to his faculties; his right according to his *wants*;" the formula of Saint-Simonianism is in one of its halves flatly the reverse—"The position of each man according to his faculties; his right according to his *works*." There is little danger, then, that Communism will be confounded with Saint-Simonianism. The confusion of Communism with Fourierism is an error more likely to be committed. And yet between the doctrines of Cabet and those of Fourier there is irreconcilable discord. The following is an extract from a chapter of the *Destinée Sociale* of Considérant, expressly devoted to the illustration of the difference between the two systems:—

"Community is so absurd that no peasant ever submitted to it voluntarily. What man would be so much of a philosopher as to bring to the general stock twice, three times, four times, as much as his neighbour, if he were to receive in return but an equal share of the profits? * * * In the Phalanx, therefore, no community, no pell-mell, no equality. If Peter has brought a capital double of that furnished by Paul, Peter shall draw from the share assigned to capital, a revenue double that of Paul; and justly so. If it is agreed that Paul has worked three times as much as Peter, Paul shall draw from the share of labour a portion three times as large as Peter; and justly so. If the relations of their talent are as one to four, their shares in respect of talent shall be as one to four; and this also justly. In all this there will be justice, because there will be not equality, but proportion. If there were equal retribution, there would be monstrous injustice. Moreover, Peter and Paul, and all the others, shall lodge as they please, consulting their own tastes and the fulness of their purses, either in a luxurious or in a modest apartment; and so also they shall dine at whatever cost they please; only the one and the other and all of them shall be ten or twenty times better treated for the same money under the societarism than they could be under piece-meal regime."

Differing as they do, however, in principle and character, the three systems known as Saint-Simonianism, Fourierism, and

Communism, all agree in one respect; in the promise, namely, that they hold out of an indefinite amelioration of the condition of the working-classes. Hence the tendency to think of them together, if not to amalgamate them. Filtrating downwards through the mass of the population, modified by the popular exigencies and wishes, receiving sometimes a tincture of bitterness and malevolence by contact with individual misery, and mingling also, it must be added, with much of wilful and deliberate profligacy, the three systems of doctrine have at length become diffused, in the double form of a moral restlessness and a special intellectual tendency, through the whole of French society. In Paris, in Lyons, and in all the other great centres of French industry—wherever, in short, there are clubs, reading-rooms, debating-societies, meetings of young men, there, based on the general Saint-Simonian expectation of a splendid future for the working-classes, are discussed the means of bringing it about. The French *ouvriers*, especially the printers, cabinet-makers, weavers, designers, and members of such other trades as usually furnish in this country the more intelligent class of Chartists, are said to have a wonderful aptitude for such speculations. Generalities and verbal formulæ that are here confined to men of special culture, are there familiar in the *Atelier*. The idea, hardly yet current in the literature of this country, that as the working-classes of Europe have already passed successively through the three stages of slavery, serfdom, and hired service, so there may be yet a fourth stage in reserve for them, as superior to hired service as hired service is to serfdom, or serfdom to slavery—is in France the growing faith of the working-classes themselves. In Paris, especially, such views are common; they are to the Parisian *ouvriers* what the points of the Charter are to the workmen of Manchester or London. Nor is this a fact of yesterday. While Louis-Philippe was still on the throne, and while the Duke of Orleans was still the heir-apparent, ideas and feelings that never found their way to the tribune of the Chamber of Deputies, and that were unknown in the breasts of representatives of the people, were rife in the workshops of Paris.

Upon the whole, the tendency of the workmen seems to have been towards the most thorough and levelling of the three systems—to wit, Communism. The form, however, in which they liked to conceive the doctrines of Communism, appears to have been not the vague pictorial form of Cabet, but that more specific and practical form that had been provided for them in 1839, by Louis Blanc in his *Organization du Travail*; the peculiarity of that form consisting, as all know, in its supposed fitness as a means of transition out of the present condition of society into

the condition that is to succeed it. Raising a capital by way of loan from the community, the State, said Louis Blanc, ought to expend that capital in the establishment of a limited number of national workshops in various departments of industry; these workshops to be organized on the principle of strict community or equality, so that all the workmen, contributing each according to their power in the matter of labour, should receive the same exact share of the profits. These workshops, forming as it were so many new organic centres, in the midst of a society viciously constituted on the principle of individualism or unlimited competition, would gradually work a change on that society, penetrating it farther and farther the longer they remained in operation, till at length the organization on the principle of association would pervade the whole.

Seizing, for the most part, on this swift and simple form of Communism, the workmen of Paris adopted also the phrase that had accompanied it, *Organization of Labour*. There was in this phrase a convenience for the occasion, as well as intrinsic aptness. It was general enough to include all the varieties of opinion that it was desirable at the moment to harmonize. Communism meant one thing, Fourierism another, Saint-Simonianism a third; but all three were included in the phrase, *Organization of Labour*. Somewhat more of precision, indeed, might have been secured by the adoption of the more lengthy formula—*Organization of Labour on the co-operative principle*; which, while it would have included all the Communists and Fourierists, would have excluded hardly any of the democratic Saint-Simonians. But the shorter watchword was, upon the whole, the best. In converting this watchword, however, into a name for the party agreeing to use it, there was a difficulty. *Organizationists of Labour* would have been too clumsy; it was necessary, therefore, to find a synonym. The word *Socialists* here presented itself. Equally precise and equally vague with the practical signification that it was meant to have, it was at once adopted. Whether used by itself, or lengthened, for the purpose of more strict political contrast, into the name *Social Republicans*, it indicated exactly the hopes and tendencies of the party, their devotion to a particular class of speculations, their eagerness for a social rather than a mere political Revolution. The old Saint-Simonian philosophers; the Humanitarian, Pierre Leroux, and his disciple George Sand; the Fourierist, Victor Considérant, and his whole school; Babouvists, or Equalitarian Communists, if any such existed; Fraternal or Icarian Communists of the school of Cabet; the political aspirant Louis Blanc, and whoever were willing to support his scheme,—all could co-operate provisionally, and for present ends, under the name of Socialists

or Social Republicans. Nay, the name would include men not exactly belonging to any class, not pledged to any system; men, on the one hand, like the ex-priest Lamennais, believing, with hazy eye, in a mystic Future unlike all the Past; or men, on the other, like Ledru-Rollin, already at work in the field of politics, and often startling his colleagues in the Chamber of Deputies, by unwelcome talk of certain miseries out of doors that it was the business of Parliaments to attend to.

Such were the two great parties that rushed forward to seize the sovereignty that Louis-Philippe had dropped—the Political Republicans, who wanted only to eradicate monarchy and maintain order till the population of France should declare its will; and the Social Republicans, who wanted, if possible, to confiscate the Revolution immediately in behalf of certain ideas, more or less precise, that they had in their heads.

At the first moment of the Revolution, the two parties, as yet imperfectly known to each other, found themselves in coalition, like men standing among the ruins left by a fire. Of the eleven persons hastily placed in the Provisional Government by the necessity of the hour—some by popular acclamation in the Chamber, and others by the activity of democratic clubs in the city—seven, namely, Dupont de l'Éure, aged 81 years, Arago, aged 61, Lamartine, aged 57, Crémieux, aged 51, Marie, aged 52, Garnier-Pagès and Marrast, each aged about 40, were Political; and four, namely, Ledru-Rollin, aged 40, Louis Blanc, aged 34, Ferdinand Flocon, and Albert (Ouvrier,) aged 32, were Social Republicans. In dividing them thus, we judge from the tenor of their subsequent conduct; the distinction had not yet declared itself, nor even now is it possible to arrange them exactly with a reference to their minuter differences. Of the four that we have named as Social Republicans, Louis Blanc alone could be called a Socialist by system. The other three, however, sympathized so far with him as to form a party in his favour; and as the *National* was the organ of the more moderate party, so Ledru-Rollin lent his paper, the *Réforme*, to represent the views of himself and his associates.

And now began the struggle between the two parties. From the windows of the Hotel de Ville, Lamartine withstood the crowd demanding that the red flag should be hoisted as the flag of the Republic, and secured the triumph of the tricolor. The red flag, although not demanded by the minority of the Provisional Government, would have been a symbol that they could have accepted. It was the rough popular assertion of their own view that, now that the Republic was obtained, something thorough should be done with it. But if so far the spirit of moderation prevailed, yet in giving to the Revolution its name and

character, in stamping upon it the impress that was to distinguish it in history from all preceding Revolutions, in deciding what were to be its first acts and proclamations, the extreme party won the day. This was natural. The Political Republicans, having never looked beyond the act of acquiring the Republic, did not know what to do with it now that they had it in their hands. The abolition of capital punishment for political offences was indeed a splendid inspiration, worthy of a poet swaying the heart of a people. But other things than the abolition of the guillotine for statesmen were required from the Revolution; and what these things should be, only the Socialist members of the Government could say. They, therefore, stepped forward, and relieved their colleagues of all trouble in the matter. "You attend to the foreign nations," they virtually said to Lamartine; "we will manage France." Arago, Marrast, and the rest, were taken by surprise or overpowered; and the following manifestos went forth to the country in succession:—

"DECREE, 25th February 1848.

"The Provisional Government of the French Republic binds itself to guarantee the existence of the workman by labour;

"It binds itself to guarantee labour to all citizens;

"It recognises the right of workmen to associate among themselves for the enjoyment of the legitimate profits of their labour;

"The Provisional Government restores to the workmen, to whom it belongs, the million that falls in of the Civil List."

"DECREE, 27th February 1848.

"The Provisional Government Decrees the immediate establishment of National Workshops.

"The Minister of Public Works is charged with the execution of this Decree."

"PROCLAMATION, 28th February 1848.

"Considering that the Revolution made by the people should be made for them;

"That it is time to put an end to the long and unjust sufferings of labourers;

"That the question of labour is of supreme importance;

"That there is nothing more high, more worthy the thoughts of a Republican Government;

"That it pertains above all to France to study ardently and resolve a problem now pending in all the industrial nations of Europe;

"That it is necessary without the least delay to guarantee to the people the legitimate fruits of their labour;

"The Provisional Government of the Republic Decrees:

"A permanent commission, to be called *Commission of Government for the Labouring Classes*, shall be appointed with the express and special charge of attending to the condition of those classes.

"To show what importance the Provisional Government of the Re-

public attaches to the solution of this great problem, it names as President of the Commission for the Labouring Classes, one of its members, M. Louis Blanc, and as Vice-President another of its members, M. Albert, workman.

"Workmen shall be called to take part in the Commission.

"The seat of the Commission shall be at the Palace of the Luxembourg."

In these three Decrees* we have the germ of the whole Revolution, so far as it assumed a peculiar character. Take away these Decrees and their sequel of consequences, and the movement is bereft of all originality, and becomes but a repetition, in somewhat new circumstances, of what occurred in 1792. Three things, it will be observed, are included in the Decrees—1st, The adoption by the Republic of the abstract principle, that the State is bound to guarantee the means of subsistence to all its citizens; 2d, The establishment of national workshops; 3d, The establishment of a commission to inquire, with a view to future legislation, into the whole question of the condition of the working-classes. Of the abstract principle so boldly adopted by the Republic we shall yet have to speak; meanwhile let us trace the history of the two practical measures, upon whose success or failure it very much depended whether the principle itself would be retained or abandoned.

And, first, of the national workshops, the famous *Ateliers Nationaux*, organized not by Louis Blanc, as people in this country persist in believing, (misled by the force of the association between his name and theirs,) but by the Minister of Public Works, M. Marie, on principles of his own, against the will of Louis Blanc, as now appears, and with the express intention, it is said, of lessening his influence with the people.

The number of men that the Revolution found or threw out of employment in Paris must have been very great. The first business of the Republic, and especially of a Republic that had

* Caussidière relates some curious particulars relative to the discussions in the Provisional Government in the matter of these Decrees. The first, recognising the general principle of the Right to Labour, was passed within twenty-four hours after the victory of the people, and also, it appears, without hesitation, general principles being cheap, and some social declaration absolutely inevitable. Here, however, Arago, Ledru-Rollin, and others of the Moderate party wished to stop, the Provisional Government being bound, they said, to abstain from deciding any question whatever. But an empty abstraction would not satisfy the people, nor their Socialist representatives in the Government. The trades came in procession with banners to the Hotel de Ville, and demanded through their delegates a Ministry of Labour. Louis Blanc supported the prayer of the people, and threatened to resign if it were refused. Arago adjured him by his grey hairs to renounce this terrible idea of the organization of labour, but in vain. At length Marrast and Garnier-Pagès proposed as a compromise, a Commission of Inquiry, instead of a Ministry. The third Decree was accordingly written. "It is very strong; it is very strong," said Marrast, as he signed it.

acknowledged the right of all to the means of subsistence, must be to provide work for these men. There was but one way of doing this ; to look out, namely, for whatever public works, such as levelling, draining, road making, were in progress, or could be begun anywhere in the neighbourhood of Paris, and to employ the men on these. This was, accordingly, what was actually done. On the 1st of March, public works of this description were begun at several points in Paris and its neighbourhood ; at one place 1500 men, including members of all professions, were set to work, digging and levelling ; at another 600 men were employed in terrace-making ; at another 800 men in cutting a road ; and altogether, in one way or other, about 5000 men were provided with a means of livelihood. Each of the spots where this kind of work was going on, was called an *Atelier National* ; and the mode of admission was as follows : Any workman producing at the *mairie* of his *arrondissement* a certificate from his landlord proving him a resident of Paris, was to be furnished with a ticket of admission to the *Ateliers Nationaux*, which ticket was to entitle him to employment at any *Atelier* not-already full.

Soon, however, all the *Ateliers* were full ; and hundreds of workmen were going about from place to place with useless tickets, fatigued and discontented. They were entitled indeed to a daily allowance of one franc fifty centimes, on showing a certificate that they had applied and could not be admitted, but this rather increased the confusion. At this moment, M. Emile Thomas, a citizen pursuing on a large scale the profession of industrial or manufacturing chemist, and who till then had taken no part in politics, presented himself with an introduction to M. Marie, the Minister of Public Works, and detailed a scheme that he had in view for regulating the *Ateliers Nationaux*. This scheme consisted in calling in the aid of the pupils of the Central School of Arts and Manufactures, already eager to be employed in any such service, and distributing them in the capacity of officers among the workmen at the *Ateliers*, thus forming a kind of semi-military organization for carrying on public works in the neighbourhood of Paris. Remitted by the separate *mairies* to an appointed place in a quiet part of the city, the workmen were there to be formed—with whatever attention to the nature of their previous occupations the exigencies of the case would permit—into brigades, companies, &c., and marched off under their officers to the different places where work awaited them. This would, at least, give the Government some control over the confusion ; and, meanwhile, all efforts might be made to devise new works for those that should still be idle.

The scheme was gladly accepted by the perplexed Minister, and, on the 6th March, M. Thomas was named Commissary of

the Republic, and Director-General of the *Ateliers Nationaux*. He at once entered on his duties, and established himself at the place appointed for the central administration—the Pavilion and Gardens of Monceaux, situated in the suburbs, and once the property of Cambacérès. On the 9th of March, at half-past six in the morning, the formation of the men into brigades began at this place; and on that day nearly 3000 men of the 8th arrondissement were disposed of. Each brigade consisted of 55 men and a brigadier, and was composed of five detachments of eleven men each, one of whom was chief of the detachment. On the following days, the other arrondissements were taken up; and, before the 16th of March, about 14,000 men in all were brigaded. Then came into play the higher parts of the scheme: the brigades were formed into lieutenancies of four brigades, or 225 men each, with a lieutenant in command; the lieutenancies into companies of four lieutenancies, or 901 men each, with an officer called chief of a company in command; and, finally, every three companies, or 2703 men, were under the orders of a chief of service: all the chiefs of service in an arrondissement were under the orders of the chief of that arrondissement; and the commander-in-chief presiding over all the arrondissements was M. Thomas himself. To officer so vast an army with the aid of the pupils of the Central School that co-operated with him, was clearly impossible; distributing them, therefore, through the higher grades, M. Thomas allowed the men to elect their own brigadiers and chiefs of detachments. These seem to have been the only officers that received pay; and their allowances, in comparison with those of the workmen, were as follows: a brigadier 3 francs a-day, whether employed or not; a chief of detachment $2\frac{1}{2}$ francs if employed, $1\frac{1}{2}$ francs if not; a common workman 2 francs a-day if employed, 1 franc if not. Until the 17th of March the workman, if employed, received $1\frac{1}{2}$ francs a-day, but the reduction to 1 franc was then effected.

All this was very well, supposing that the works on hand remained in proportion to the number of applicants. But daily new claimants poured in, men really in want, actors, painters, sculptors, designers, and clerks that had held out as long as they could; poor fellows of municipal guards, too, that had to bear popular insult as well as starvation; idle vagabonds, also, of all sorts, calculating on the franc a-day for doing nothing; and finally, hosts of workmen from the country, attracted by the prospect of work, and admitted into the *Ateliers*, by means of forged or borrowed certificates of residence. The elaborate organization of this vast mass of men was a mockery, so long as there was not work to set them to. If there had been an Irish bog in the neighbourhood, that they could have been sent out

under the command of their corporals, lieutenants, and captains, and colonels to reclaim ; if even the Government had resolved to build a pyramid, or make bricks with their labour, the organization might have been found effective, but, as it was, it had no strength to keep the men in order. Louis Reybaud in his novel of *Jérôme Paturot*, gives an account that does not seem overcharged, of the doings at an Atelier National. Visiting the chief Atelier—that of the pavilion of Monceaux itself, Jérôme finds a crowd of workmen of all professions, standing idle, jeering and laughing, and besieging the door of the pavilion, with cries for the director. The director at last comes forth, and asks what they want, when “work, work,” resounds on all hands. As he does not chance to have any shift ready, he retires, bidding them name deputies to confer with him, an exercise of republican rights which they seem to enjoy for its own sake. The election over, the fun goes on till the deputies return with the news that they have got work ; that they are to go, 250 of them, (a lieutenancy, we suppose,) to bring in 250 young trees which the Republic has purchased from a nursery-man, a little out of town, with which to replace the trees destroyed in the Boulevards. Forth they go to execute this commission. Arrived at the place, they are received with blank astonishment by the nursery-man, who sees 15 francs at stake in the circumstance, having contracted to bring in the trees himself in his cart for that sum ; he permits them nevertheless to take what they want, and watches, not without emotion, his young acacias, as they disappear in the hands of their rough carriers. Laughing, singing, and stopping at cabarets on the way, the men bring the trees into town, but in such a state that it is useless to plant them. The expense of the whole frolic is 1250 francs, (£50,) being three francs for each of the trees, and two francs to each man for his day’s work.

The idea of employing a portion of the idle men in replanting the Boulevards, was, as we learn from M. Thomas, the suggestion of M. Trémisot, the Head of the Board of Paving in Paris, to whom he was indebted also for many other shifts, some of them by no means so bad. One proposal indeed of M. Trémisot was so gigantic as to stun the Ministry of Public Works. This was the proposal, to employ the men in constructing in the flat grounds near the Barrière du Trône, a vast circus, with terraced seats, capable of accommodating 20,000 spectators, and so that the arena could be converted at will into a lake for exhibiting sea-fights. If it would have had no direct utility, says M. Thomas, this work would have at least survived as a splendid monument of the solicitude of the Government, and as a magnificent theatre for popular fêtes.

To protract the history of the Ateliers Nationaux through the months of April and May is unnecessary; suffice it to say, that the mass of dangerous idleness, thus accumulated in Paris, increased daily; that on the 19th of May, a census of those enrolled, showed the whole number to be 87,942 men, drawn from about 190 different professions; and that before the end of May, the number probably amounted to 100,000, of whom, owing to the difficulty of devising work, not 15,000 were employed, the rest receiving their allowance of one franc a day instead. The Ateliers Nationaux therefore degenerated into a mere system of relieving pauperism in disguise. And yet in France at that moment, no one had a title to say so, for was it not a fundamental principle decreed in the very preamble of the Republic, that the country owed all its citizens the means of subsistence, not as a charity but as a right?

In the meantime, while masses of workmen were thus accumulating in Paris under the auspices of M. Marie, as Minister of Public Works, Louis Blanc and his associates at the Luxembourg were keeping strictly to their own less tremendous business of expiscating the true theory of the organization of labour.

On the 2d of March, as we learn from the authorized report, the first meeting of the new Commission took place, Louis Blanc presiding, Albert sitting near him, and about 200 workmen, delegates from the different trades, occupying the luxurious benches recently reserved for the French peers. No sooner had the object of the Commission been explained by the President, than two demands were made by the delegates—the reduction of the hours of labour, and the abolition of the system of *marchandage*, that is, of the tyranny of sub-contractors over workmen. On these two points there seemed to be a wonderful unanimity among the workmen of Paris, as if they had agreed long ago to take their stand upon them. Undertaking to give them immediate consideration, Louis Blanc dismissed the assembly, and next day a meeting of a number of master-tradesmen having been called, that *their* opinion might be ascertained, it was agreed to grant what was asked. A decree of the Government was therefore immediately issued, abolishing *marchandage*, and limiting the hours of work to ten in Paris, and eleven in the provinces. Arbitrary or not, says Louis Blanc, this measure was necessary to secure peace.

Day after day, the Commission assembled at the Luxembourg. The effective business was managed by the President, the Vice-President, and a committee of ten working men, chosen by lot from among the delegates, with whom were associated also a number of persons, supposed to be capable from the special nature of their occupations or studies, of affording valuable assistance. Occa-

sionally, however, a general meeting was held of the whole body of the delegates, when, amid applauses such as had never been heard in that hall before, Louis Blanc would rehearse the doctrines of his book from beginning to end, its expositions of the fearful evils arising from mercantile competition, and the principle of *laissez-faire*, and its affirmation of the possibility of commencing a gradual re-organization of society, by means of a few model-establishments of workmen associated on communist principles. The only novelty in the way of theory that seems to have been the result of the conversations, slightly mingled with debate, that took place on the general subject of the organization of labour, is presented in a discourse delivered by the President on the 3d of April. In this discourse, more distinctly than in any part of his *Organization du Travail*, Louis Blanc commits himself to the essential principle of fraternal Communism as expounded by Cabet; namely, that the ideal state of society is that in which each man, producing according to his aptitudes and powers, shall consume according to his wants. Though we are still far from this ideal; says Louis Blanc—our present vicious civilisation both concealing aptitudes and begetting factitious wants—yet we are tending towards it, and equality of salaries would be a step in the right direction.

Oratory and discussions of theory were not, however, the sole business of the Commission. In that terrible commercial crisis that had been occasioned by the Revolution, when, according to the calculation of M. Chevalier, the loss in Paris alone, arising from the suspension of all kinds of industry, amounted to two millions of francs or £80,000 a-day, the Palace of the Luxembourg was the general dépôt for all complaints. Hither came heads of bankrupt establishments, anxious that the State should buy them up, and make Communist ateliers or whatever it chose with them; hither came masters against whom their men were in revolt; hither came journeymen to denounce their masters. In such a chaos the Commission found plenty to do. Interfering wherever it was possible, it effected, according to Louis Blanc, numerous reconciliations, and saved Paris many a scene of riot. On the 29th of March, for instance, there was a universal strike among the journeymen bakers, the object of which was that they, the worst used class of mankind, might fish some boon out of this great Revolution. That morning Paris was in danger of wanting bread. The master-bakers, dreading results, rushed to the Luxembourg. Here a hasty conference was held, masters being heard on the one side, and delegates from the men on the other; a satisfactory arrangement was effected, and Paris, little knowing the risk it had run, awoke to its breakfast. In a similar manner were adjusted dif-

ferences among the paviors, the cabmen, the slaters, the washerwomen, &c. Usually, says Louis Blanc, it was the masters that applied first at the Luxembourg in such cases ; but generally the men and they left it together.

This was not all. To illustrate by actual example the views of Louis Blanc and his associates, two industrial associations were founded on the principle of equality, the one an association of working tailors, using for their atelier the ancient prison of Clichy ; the other, an association of working saddlers, occupying a barracks in the Champs Élysées. The former included 1200 workmen, electing their own foremen, and sharing the profits equally ; the latter was not quite so numerous, but was similarly organized. Both had received large orders from the Government, the tailors for military clothing, and the saddlers for horse-gear, and both were in an extremely flourishing condition. These two associations, said Louis Blanc, in a recent letter to the *Times*, were the only *Ateliers Nationaux* for whose establishment he was responsible ; and they were then still in existence. Besides these, the Commission set on foot several model lodging-houses.

Finally, amassing all the information possible, relative to the condition of the working-classes, and resuming in a succinct shape all the practical suggestions that had been elicited, the Commission prepared an elaborate scheme to be submitted to the approaching Constituent Assembly, as the basis for that reorganization of industry in all its branches, whether agricultural, commercial, or manufacturing, of which it was hoped Republican France would set an example to the world.

Meanwhile towards this very Constituent Assembly, appointed to meet on the 4th of May, all the hopes of France were directed. While M. Marie, like another Frankenstein, was gazing on his *Ateliers Nationaux*, and Louis Blanc was occupied with his commission at the Luxembourg, all France was agitated with preparations for the elections. As in the Provisional Government there were two parties, the Political and the Social Republicans, so did this division permeate the whole country. Scarcely had the first shock of the Revolution been over, when, deserting by inevitable necessity their tattered standards of yesterday, Louis-Philippists and Constitutional Monarchists crowded round the new party of the Moderate Republicans, to prevent a movement that had gone too far, as they thought, already, from going any farther. Odilon Barrot associated with Lamartine ; and Thiers, emerging from a temporary obscurity, was seen hanging on their skirts and looking smilingly on. All this soon became manifest throughout the country ; reactionary symptoms, as they were called, broke out ; and the

Socialists were put upon their mettle lest this Revolution, that they had hoped to confiscate for their peculiar ideas, should elude them after all. Hence the circulars of Ledru-Rollin, one of which, Caussidière tells us, was written for him by George Sand. The whole Socialist party, in short, were in arms; let us see then, what accession of strength they had in the meantime acquired, and what alteration of character they had, in the meantime, undergone.

The outburst of new opinion in France after the Revolution of February was tremendous. Doctrines and passions that had lain deep down in the uttermost corners of society, repressed thither by the restraining discipline of the monarchy, now came forth as it were in blotches. In the months of March and April several hundreds of new journals—no restriction being now imposed on publication—appeared in Paris alone; and in the very week after the Revolution there were founded in the same city 150 new clubs. Every needy fool that had relations with a printer started a newspaper; every landlord that had a large room to let originated a club. The French vocabulary was ransacked for names for these new organs of public opinion. Among the newspapers were *The Duck*, *The Volcano*, *The Red Bullets*, *Mother Michel*, and *The Devil's Eye-Glass*; among the clubs were the *Club of Rights and Duties*, the *Club of the Rights of Man*, and some dozen *Clubs of the People*. The majority of these journals and clubs were on the side of Socialism, so far at least as a blind vehemence towards anarchy may be said to have been on that side. Among them, however, were some that were expressly and emphatically Socialist, and that deserve notice from their eminence over the others. Such were, among the newspapers, the *Peuple Constituant* of Lamennais, the *Vraie République* of Thoré, supported by Pierre Leroux, George Sand, and Barbès, as contributors, the *Ami du Peuple* of Raspail, the *Commune de Páris* of Sobrier, and the *Populaire* and *Père Duchesne* of Cabet; and among the clubs, the *Club Blanqui*, the *Club Sobrier*, the *Club Raspail*, the *Club Cabet*, and the *Club de la Révolution*, of which Barbès was president, and Thoré, Leroux, and other well-known Socialists, members. Making the reckoning in men, it may be said that among the most powerful auxiliaries to the ranks of effective Socialism immediately after the Revolution were these five persons—Barbès, Sobrier, Thoré, Blanqui, and Raspail;—Barbès, who had been condemned to death under Louis-Philippe, and whom, when the Revolution had released him from his long imprisonment with a bearded and wo-worn face, the people flocked to see, as a political martyr; Sobrier, a young man of fortune, in whom political enthusiasm had taken the form of a wild semi-religious

illuminism; Thoré, already known as a Socialist writer, and now stepping forward as a leader; Blanqui, a restless erratic soul, charged, says Lamartine, with the electricity of the time, and bearing in his countenance the marks of the long suffering, bodily and mental, that he had endured in his previous career as a conspirator; and Raspail, a chemist, remembered as one of the chief witnesses in the case of Madame Laffarge, and now in his new capacity as a theorist for the people, dealing forth drugs of the strongest. But a man, also added to the band of Socialist chiefs at this moment, and far transcending both in genius and courage, if not in the tact for immediate action, any one of those just mentioned, was a man whose name may yet be a terror in Europe—P. J. Proudhon.

Born in 1809, at Besançon, the birth-place, by the way, of Fourier, Proudhon, whose parents were in humble circumstances, began life there as a compositor in a printing-office. This printing-office he afterwards occupied on his own account; but some years ago he quitted Besançon for an engagement in a mercantile house at Lyons. Devoted in youth to metaphysical, theological, and philological studies, his subsequent operations have rendered him familiar with questions of banking, inland navigation, and general traffic. In 1839, while still residing at Besançon, he produced his first work, an essay entitled, *On the Celebration of the Sabbath*, the Academy of Besançon having offered a prize for the best memoir on that subject. In this work, now regarded as one of the most extraordinary in the French language, the Sabbatic institution was defended from the author's point of view, with a power of argument quite amazing; but as it contained opinions on social points that the Academy could not subscribe, it did not gain their approbation, and the author gave it to the world himself. For the same learned society he produced in the following year a second essay, entitled, *What is Property?* in which the anti-social doctrines that had appeared in the first, were developed with such audacity that, when it was printed, the society publicly disclaimed all connexion with it. The book, however, was of a kind to become widely known; read in some circles of Paris it made people there aware of the existence of some eccentric paradoxical being living at Besançon; and the attention of the Minister of Justice having been called to it, the author narrowly escaped prosecution as an enemy to public order. The impression made by this treatise was renewed from time to time by subsequent works from the same pen, including a *Second Memoir on Property*, a pamphlet called *Warning to Proprietors*, a volume entitled *On the Creation of Order in Humanity* published in 1843, and a large work published in 1846, and named *Economic Contradic-*

tions or the *Philosophy of Misery*, besides tracts on *Credit and Currency*, and on the *Competition between Canals and Railways*. It was only a month or two before the Revolution that the author, then about thirty-nine years of age, came to reside in Paris, presenting himself to people who had already known him through his books, as a man of spare and somewhat peculiar figure, with severe hirsute visage, and wearing spectacles.

To give an idea of Proudhon to those that have not seen any of his writings is impossible. To say that he is a Socialist, or even that he is the most daring and profound of Socialists, is to call up a notion very insufficient. Of an intellect that one would call enormous, plying a remorseless logic, bringing into literature a plainness of speech quite unusual, and paying deference to hardly any man or sect that he names, one regards him at first as a great scornful misanthrope dealing blows out of sheer hate. Even then, however, one admits his gifts as a writer—the terrible energy of his style, the almost blasting eloquence that bursts up amid his algebraic reasonings, the resistless force with which he makes the French language go down to depths that it rarely seems to reach. At length, through some characteristic passage, one sees him better, and recognises in him a man whose mood is that of fierce and universal intolerance. Not as a smooth-tongued flatterer does he come before the people, with the French balderdash in his mouth of *gloire, honneur*, &c., but as a task-master with a whip of scorpions. That crime is punishable and retribution just, that work is obligatory, that marriage is holy and all unchastity an offence against nature, that a lie is a murder of the intelligence, that law is not the expression of will either individual or general, but the *dictamen* of conscience applied by reason, that he who provokes to debauch either by word or writing is infamous, and that he who denies God is frantic—such are the sayings that he seems to rest in and recur to, careless whether or not, to use one of his own expressions, his readers may find the medicine too harsh, the brewage too bitter. Though he marches, therefore, in the same general direction as the Socialists, it is in a character quite his own; and with a disposition ever and anon to knock one of them down. Caussidière, for example, loving him as he says extremely, yet cannot but lament very much that waywardness that leads him, in his fits of despondency, “to turn round on his own supporters, and to treat men as if they were nine-pins.” On many points Proudhon is at one with the Economists.

Yet, honourably distinguished as he is among French writers by his moral strictness as a theorist on many cardinal points, his heresies of general doctrine are more stupendous, more subversive of the fabric of society, than the paradoxes of all other wri-

ters put together. It is of one of these heresies, in particular, that we are here to speak.

Seeking in vain, he says, in books for an explanation of the misery that is in the world, he resolved to investigate the thing himself. And, as Copernicus, finding that he could make no way in the explication of astronomical phenomena so long as he supposed the firmament to turn round, succeeded when he supposed the spectator to turn round, and Kant by a precisely similar device had effected a revolution in metaphysics, might not this method answer also in ethics? In other words, might not the cause of evil be not in society without, but in the constitution of the human reason?

Psychologists tell us that all our perceptions are determined by certain general laws of the spirit itself, certain necessary forms or types pre-existing in the understanding, and technically called *Categories*,—such are the ideas of Space, Time, Cause, Substance, &c. Now, without denying this, one may lay it down as a fact not less true, that habit has the power of impressing on the understanding new categorical forms, derived from the world of appearances, and which, although they may be fallacious, will yet exert an influence on our thoughts and conduct not less strong than that exerted by the original categories themselves. Such a secondary categorical form was the belief, held until the discovery of the law of gravitation annihilated it, that the existence of the Antipodes was impossible. And so in morals, habit may have engrained into the constitution of the mind itself certain perverted ideas of the real fact of things.

Among all the principles on which society now reposes, the one that, according to Proudhon, answers best to the definition of a false secondary category, and that also, from its extreme antiquity may be supposed accountable for much if not all the misery with which our race is burdened, is that peculiar modification of the sentiment of justice that constitutes the idea of Property. This idea of Property, this notion that a man can in any circumstances whatever truly say of a thing *this is mine*, this belief that any individual can possess a right to a single atom of the earth's substance or its produce beyond that varying fraction that would remain to him if the whole sum to be shared were perpetually divided afresh by the whole number of those that were to share it—this idea, this notion, this belief, Proudhon undertakes to prove to be fallacious, unjust, null, disastrous, and damnable.

He divides his argument into three parts. In the first he examines the various theories of the Right of Property that have been given to the world—as that it is a natural right, that it arises from the act of occupation, that it is a creation of the civil law, that it is a result of labour and skill expended in appropriation,

that it is founded on universal consent, that it is derived from prescription; and all these theories he successively declares absurd and futile. In the second part he enters on the field of Political Economy, and tries to demonstrate that although property may manifest itself as an accident, yet as an institution and in principle it is mathematically impossible. This is the part of the book into which, owing to the form of the reasoning, it is most difficult to follow him. The third section he entitles "Psychological Exposition of the Ideas of Just and Unjust, and Determination of the Principle of Government and of Right." Here, recognising property as a fact in the present condition of the world, he attempts to explain its origin and the causes of its establishment, and of its long duration; after which he expounds how, in virtue of an organic law in society ceaselessly acting to destroy it, it must at last entirely disappear.

To pursue the writer through the various stages of this strange *mélange* of argument is clearly impossible at present; the following, however, may be taken as the general doctrine of the book in its most abstract shape: That the human race are jointly and corporately the possessors, although not the proprietors, of the sphere of material conditions into which they have been ushered; that they are associated together, in the first place, by a certain low instinct, common to them with the inferior animals, that may be called Sociability; that, man being gifted with Reason to reflect upon himself, this instinct rises in him into an intelligent principle, called Right or Justice, the essence of which consists in the recognition in others of a personality equal to one's own; that it is upon this principle that all society and all civil law should be founded, and that therefore inequality of material conditions, or the government of one man by another, is unjust and against nature, every man being entitled to occupy a portion of the whole field of things, varying directly as the space that there is, and inversely as the number of those that are to occupy it—a rule which renders impossible the formation of property; that the extinction of property, and a return to equality of material conditions, and to anarchy, or entire individual freedom, are consequently incumbent on the race, and that forces are at work that will effect this, whether men will or not, as certainly as an equation disengages itself; but, finally, that above this sphere of justice, there is a higher sphere reserved for the exercise of a third degree of sociability, that may be called Equity or Proportionality, the nature of which it is to recognise individual differences or natural inequalities, as those of virtue, talent, &c., between man and man, and to allot to each his due portion of esteem, love, admiration, hate, or disgust, all of which, being attitudes of human spirits towards each other in the

sphere of the infinite, are not incompatible with strict equality in the sphere of the finite.

In this proposition we have tried to piece together, and grasp as a whole, the doctrine of Proudhon, so far as it is developed in his *Qu'est-ce que la Propriété?* Proudhon, however, does not confine himself to the mere evolution of his ideas in an abstract and philosophic form; on the contrary, he delights in daring and startling appeals to the passions, and seems on principle to spare his readers no shock that he can give them. For example:—

“ If, in order to prolong for some years an unlawful enjoyment, one should allege that it suffices not to demonstrate equality, that it is also necessary to organize it, that, above all, it is necessary to establish it without ruptures, I should have a right to reply: The breast of the oppressed goes before the embarrassment of ministers; equality of conditions is a primordial law, to which economy and jurisprudence must succumb. The right to labour, and to an equal participation of goods, cannot bend itself before the anxieties of power; it is not for the working man to harmonize contradictions of codes, still less to endure the blunders of government; it is for the civil and administrative power, on the contrary, to reform itself on the principle of equality. The evil that is known should be condemned and destroyed; the legislator cannot take grounds, from his ignorance of order, for establishing patent iniquity. There is no temporizing with restitution. Justice, justice; recognition of right; the re-institution of the working man: after that, judges and consuls, see to your police, and provide for the government of the Republic.”—*Qu'est-ce que la Propriété*, p. 216.

“ What form of government, then, are we to prefer? doubtless, asks one of my young readers. You are a Republican? Republican, yes; but that word explains nothing. *Res publica* is public business: Kings are Republicans. Well, then, you are a Democrat? No! What, you are a Monarchist? No! Constitutionalist? God forbid! You are an Aristocrat, then? Not at all! You would have a mixed government? Still less! What are you, then? I am an Anarchist.—O, I understand, you are concocting a satire? In no sense; you have heard my serious and deliberately-weighted profession of faith; although a very good friend to order, I am, in all the force of the term, an Anarchist.”—*Ibid.*, p. 237.

“ Anarchy, absence of master, of sovereign, (people ordinarily attribute to the word *anarchy* the sense of absence of principle, absence of rule; and this is how it has become a synonym for *disorder*)—such is the form of government that we approach every day.”—*Ibid.*, p. 242.

The horrible formula in which Proudhon has expressed, and as it were summed up for practical purposes, all his various notions, is one that the newspapers must have made already fa-

miliar to our readers—"Property is Robbery; *La Propriété c'est le vol.*"

Although, as will have been remarked, the main doctrine of Proudhon is directly antagonistic to the creed of the Saint-Simoniens, denouncing that proportionality in material respects which they consecrate; although the same doctrine is also repugnant to the creed of the Fourierists, who, moreover, would repudiate Proudhon's notions respecting property as vehemently as he would scorn theirs respecting co-operation; and although, finally, even the Communists, with whom he is at one on the great point of equality of conditions, find no favour with this eccentric apostle of anarchy, but are rather mauled by him whenever they cross his path; yet the general nature of his speculations is such, that he takes rank fairly enough in that temporary coalition of the three sects known by the name of the Socialists. Nay, more, one can see that, for several years before his appearance in public life, his doctrines must have been insinuating themselves, through his books, into the general mass of Socialistic opinion, and affecting more or less the language of all the sects that have been named, but particularly of the Communists.

It was only, however, after his arrival in Paris that Proudhon became fully known. Led by some inscrutable providence to the scene of action precisely at the time when his services were about to be required, no sooner had the Revolution occurred than his haggard influence was felt. In the columns of the *Représentant du Peuple* it was easy to recognise the hand of the enemy of property, the anarchist of Besançon. In the *Club de la Révolution*, also, seated beside bilious Barbès, untidy old Léroux, and Herculean Thoré, might be seen the figure of the terrible philosopher with the spectacles. Whatever his eccentricity, whatever his irritability of temper, his immense energy was indisputable; and when, in anticipation of the elections, the united democratic party of Paris drew up a list of candidates for the Department of the Seine, including ten Socialist or democratic leaders, and twenty-four working men, Proudhon's name was inserted among the former, along with those of Louis Blanc, Albert, Ledru-Rollin, Flocon, Caussidière, Léroux, Barbès, Thoré, and Raspail.

When the elections occurred, however, only five of these pre-eminent Socialists, viz., Caussidière, Albert, Ledru-Rollin, Flocon, and Louis Blanc, found themselves in the list of successful candidates; and this was but a type of the result all over France. Out of 900 Representatives, probably not more than 200 could, by any method of counting, be ranked as Social and Democratic Republicans; and even of these the real and thorough Socialists formed but a fraction. Of the 700 Representa-

tives, on the other hand, constituting the Moderate party, a large proportion, though Republican by the necessity of their position, were not in heart Republican at all. In short, it was clear that a reaction was in progress; and this fact became still more evident when the Assembly, on the 9th of May, that is, on the fifth day of their sittings, chose as members of the Executive Committee that was to supersede the Provisional Government, these five persons—Arago, Garnier-Pagès, Marie, Lamartine, and Ledru-Rollin; of whom the last alone belonged to the extreme party.

Sullen discontent reigned among the Socialists of Paris. Louis Blanc, now out of office, repeated in the Assembly his demand for a Ministry of Labour and Progress. It was refused. This increased the ferment. An accident soon showed in what relations the Assembly and the Parisians stood to each other. On the 15th of May a manifestation was arranged in favour of Poland; and thousands of workmen, under the banners of various clubs and of the *Ateliers Nationaux*, came to present a petition in this cause to the too laxly guarded Assembly. Whether by chance or otherwise, the demonstration soon changed its purpose. Dashing past the guard, a crowd of men in blouses stormed the lobby of the House, burst into the galleries, filling them till they cracked, and at length pouring into the hall, scattered the members like chaff. Louis Blanc was carried in triumph; Raspail, Blanqui, and Barbès spoke from the tribune; and, mounting a bench, citizen Hubert, a former political prisoner, roared out that the Assembly was dissolved. The proclamation, however, was premature: Paris had rallied, and in a little while a body of National Guards entered at quick march, and reinstated the members in their seats. Albert, Barbès, Sobrier, and General Courtais, the commander of the guard, were forthwith arrested.

The Assembly, sufficiently warned of their position by this outbreak, resolved to act with vigour. Their chief attention was necessarily directed to the *Ateliers Nationaux*. An army of 100,000 men, divided into brigades and regiments under pretence of work, and having no work to do, was a fearful avalanche to assemble under. The *Ateliers Nationaux* must be dissolved at all hazards. Such was the resolution of the Assembly, and as a first step towards their object, they kidnapped (literally so) poor M. Emile Thomas, who was inclined to be refractory, and sent him off on an improvised mission to Bourdeaux. M. Lalanne, Engineer of Roads and Bridges, was appointed his successor. To calm the fears of the workmen, however, a special commission was appointed to consult with the executive power as to ways and means, and it was officially intimated that no measure should be taken in relation to the *Ateliers Nationaux*

until "sure and numerous outlets" could be provided for the honest and industrious labourers.

This promise could not be kept. For a little while the Parisians were occupied with the supplementary election of eleven candidates for the city to fill up blanks that had been caused by resignations and other circumstances. The elections took place on the 5th of June, when the returns yielded this strange result—Moreau, Goudchaux, Changarnier, Thiers, Pierre Leroux, Victor Hugo, Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, Lagrange, Boissel, Proudhon, and (once more) Caussidière. Thus while the Assembly gained in Thiers, Changarnier, &c., men of the old regime, and in Louis Napoleon an unknown element, it gained, on the other side, in Proudhon, Leroux, and Lagrange, three leading Socialists. But scarcely had the new members, Louis Napoleon excepted, taken their seats, when the bustle that had attended their election, and especially that of Napoleon, was merged in the pressing question of the Ateliers Nationaux. What plan should be pursued with them—dissolution, modification, or re-organization? Only one practical proposition was discussed, namely, that the State, taking the railways of the country into its own hands, should effect a peaceful dissolution of the Ateliers Nationaux by dispersing the men as labourers over the various unfinished and projected lines. This plan was advocated by Lamartine. "Give me railways," were his words in Committee, "and the question is quietly settled." "And what if we refuse you railways?" "You must employ cannon." The prophecy was too true. Scarcely had the *Mouiteur* of the 22d of June promulgated the decree excluding from the Ateliers Nationaux all unmarried workmen between seventeen and twenty-five years of age, and offering them enlistment as the only alternative, when the avalanche fell, and unhappy Paris was again in Revolution. For three days the cannon roared in the streets; and on the 26th of June the soldier Cavaignac sat master among the ruins.

There have not been wanting men to defend on grounds of logic the insurrection of June. If there was right on the one side of the barricades, they say, there was right also on the other. They shape their reasoning as follows:—A fundamental principle in the Constitution of France at that moment—a principle as sacred in law as Liberty of Conscience or Liberty of the Press—was the Right to Labour, the Right, that is, of every citizen to obtain from the State the means of subsistence by work. This principle was the one great result of the Revolution of February; the first act of the Provisional Government had been to decree it. Nor had it been repealed since. On the contrary, it had been in a manner ratified by the Assembly itself. On the 19th of

June, only three days before the insurrection, there had been read in the Assembly the draft of the proposed Constitution of the new Republic, as it had been prepared in the Committee appointed for the purpose. That draft contained the following Articles:—

“ART. 2. The Constitution guarantees to all citizens Liberty, Equality, Security, Instruction, *Labour*, the right of Property, Assistance.

“ART. 7. The right to Labour is the right that every man has to live by labouring. Society ought, by those productive and general means that are at its disposal, and that are hereafter to be organized, to furnish work to able-bodied men that cannot otherwise procure it.”

Such were the Articles that it was intended to place in the future Constitution of France; articles, too, prepared not by a Committee of Socialists, but by a Committee in which, associated with Considérant and perhaps but one other decided Socialist, were such men as Cormenin, Marrast, de Tocqueville, Gustave de Beaumont, and Odilon Barrot. If, now, it is granted that a fair pretext for insurrection is afforded to a people when its Government violates a principle that is fundamental, then, in dismissing a portion of workmen from the Ateliers Nationaux without providing other employment for them, the French Government must be considered to have afforded a fair pretext for the insurrection of June.

Such was the reasoning actually employed; and whatever the Government and the Constituent Assembly may have thought of the reasoning, they found it necessary to take care that it should not be possible to employ it in future. In other words, they determined to strike out of the Constitution of the Republic all guarantees of the Right to Labour.

It was on the 29th of August that the question of the new Constitution was re-opened by the reading of a second draft of a proposed Constitution before the Assembly. Although the intervening period had been important, the notable events that had occurred in it had been few. Clubs had been suppressed; newspapers extinguished or suspended; order restored by military rule; Raspail and other leaders of the insurrection imprisoned; Louis Blanc and Caussidière impeached, and driven into exile. Under the protection of Cavaignac, the Assembly had indeed continued its sittings; but apart from the proceedings instituted in relation to the insurrection, the only discussion of much interest had been a discussion on a proposition of Proudhon, that the State should appropriate, partly by way of tax, and partly by way of credit, a third part of all the rents of France, whether of lands or houses, and a third part of all the interest due on capital. This tremendous attempt of the anarchist to carry his theories into actual practice had been put

down by a universal negative. Thiers, on the 26th of July, had given in a Report of Committee unanimously reprobating the proposal; and on the 31st, after Proudhon had delivered from the tribune an unexampled speech in reply, in which he dared the Assembly single-handed, drubbed Thiers and the Socialists too, and attacked property, the validity of contracts, universal suffrage, and a hundred other things, he was met with a vote declaring his opinions to be odious.

The debates on the Constitution extended over the months of September and October. The discussion on the Right to Labour occupied many days in all; but the chief portion of it took place on the four days from the 11th to the 14th of September inclusive. For its intrinsic importance, as well as for the ability shown by the speakers, this debate deserves to rank as one of the most illustrious that have ever taken place in a Representative Assembly. It is long, at least, since any debate comparable to it has occurred in the Parliament of England. Perhaps the most remarkable of the speeches were those of De Tocqueville and Thiers *against*, that of Lamartine *regarding*, and that of Ledru-Rollin *for* the Right to Labour. Proudhon did not speak; but his opinion was well known. "Give me the Right to Labour," he had said to M. Gondehaux in the Committee of Finances, "and I will let you keep the Right of Property;"—a saying that had given great offence to his brother Socialists, as presenting their views in an unduly harsh shape, but which the Economists declared to be in strict accordance with one of the clearest truths of their science, namely, that labour can be set agoing only by capital; which capital, in the case of labour that there is no demand for, must be raised by a tax.

On the division, the numbers were 596 *against* to 187 *for* the Right to Labour.* And thus, after a short reign of seven months, was retracted, by an overwhelming majority, the single peculiar social principle that it was thought the Revolution of February had established. Of that Revolution, the only relic left is Universal Suffrage. This it would probably be difficult to retract.

The reaction had triumphed; the Socialists were beaten. At present, under the Presidency of Louis Napoleon, they exist but as a small speculative minority, probably (if we may form a guess from the state of the vote for the Presidency) about a twentieth part in all, of the French nation. Banquets are now their only demonstrations. In Paris, they are at this moment

* In this vote, the members of the former Provisional Government were distributed thus:—in the majority, Marrast and Dupont l'Eure; in the minority, Garnier-Pagès, Crémieux, Ledru-Rollin, and Flocon; absent, Louis Blanc and Albert; abstained from voting, Lamartine, Arago, and Marie.

the established subject of public laughter. In the *Illustration*, and other illustrated newspapers, there are weekly caricatures of Leroux, Proudhon, Thoré, and other leading Socialists. *Jérôme Paturot*—a wretched production in ridicule of the whole movement of 1848—is the popular novel of the day. At one of the Parisian theatres, there has been produced, under the title of *La Propriété c'est le vol*, a farce, in which the Socialists are attacked with a license as regards personality unequalled since the days of Aristophanes. When, in the course of the performance, Proudhon is introduced as the devil, the applause is tremendous. Nor are more serious answers to the Socialists wanting. The report of what has occurred in Texas has brought down a storm of indignation upon Cabet. In a shrewd, witty, shallow book, Thiers has stepped forward as the champion of property. Less popular, perhaps, but far more profound, and far more effective as an exposure of the errors of the Socialists, are the Letters of Michel Chevalier.

To one who remembers February last, all this seems very strange. A people retracting what so recently they established; laughing at what so recently they revered! But let no one think that the history is yet at an end. The Presidency of Louis Napoleon is but a mystic covering of emotion rolled over the thoughts of France. There are wild elements underneath. The existence of such a man as Proudhon is no jest in Europe.

- ART. II.—1. *The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer, with Memoir by Sir Harris Nicolas.* Pickering: London, 1845.
 2. *Cabinet Pictures of English Life—Chaucer.* Knight's Weekly Vol. XXX.
 3. *Canterbury Tales.* Do. do., Vols. LXXV. and CXIV.
 4. *Selections from the Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer.* By CHAS. D. DESHLER, with a concise Life of the Poet, and Remarks illustrative of his Genius. London, 1817.
 5. *The Poems of Geoffrey Chaucer Modernized, with Life, by Professor Leonhard Schmitz.* 1841.
 6. *Tales from Chaucer.* By CHARLES COWDEN CLARKE. 1833.
 7. *The Works of Chaucer.* By CHARLES COWDEN CLARKE. London, 1835.

THE name of Geoffrey or Geffray Chaucer, has a grateful sound to English ears, and the image which it conjures up, purified by time from every taint of ignoble association, looms large to us through the mists of the five centuries which intervene. We regard it as the “*sacra et major imago*” of the founder of that goodly fellowship of the gifted, which, since the dawn of civilisation, has been the salt and the savour of our English life, and we cherish it, as well we may, with a reverent and pious affection. But what the image of the poet thus gains in grandeur it loses in distinctness, and for our own interest, at all events, it may well be questioned whether this distant and misty reverence is exactly the species of incense which it becomes us to offer to one who, during more than half a century, within the range of our authentic history, was the greatest lay-intelligence in England, and whose life was perhaps as pregnant with consequences to our national development as that of any one man who ever existed in England at all. Would it not be more profitable to us, and perhaps not less acceptable to the shade of him, who was certainly no friend to unreasoning adoration, if we endeavoured to form for ourselves something like a definite notion of his character both as a poet and as a man, and thus to place our respect (if such should still remain to us) on the firmer basis of individual knowledge? Is it wise to rest contented with mere hearsay and second-hand information, when the question regards the first in point of time, and, in one department at least, the second in point of excellence of our native poets; or is it meet that those who would blush to be found tripping in the minutest details of classical philology, or of the modern tongues, should unhesitatingly confess, as they

but too often do, their ignorance of an author, an acquaintance with whom, *apart altogether from his intrinsic merits*, is indispensable to a knowledge of the historical development of the language which they speak? Truly the object seems worthy of some slight effort.

In order to deal with the utilitarian spirit which perhaps not improperly influences the choice of the many, in literature as in more vulgar matters, and to fix, as it were, the marketable value of Chaucer, the first question, as it seems to us, which we are bound at once to ask and to answer, is—*belongs he to the living or to the dead*; does he or does he not speak words of living interest to living men; is he or is he not an integral part of our existing civilisation?

The world is old enough to have seen many intellectual as well as political revolutions, and there are eras which boasted probably of no mean culture, irrevocably lost in the darkness of time. They are past, dead even in their effects—at least we can trace no influence which they exercise over our present life. Mediatly they may work, as the civilisation of Egypt through that of Greece, and it is nothing more than reasonable to suppose that by unseen links the earliest and the latest efforts of intelligence may be bound together; but the Pyramids teach no audible lesson except that of the mutability of human affairs, and the vast Sphinx is as silent as the sand at its base. These, for the present, we may not unfittingly hand over to the investigations of the curious; for although it were rashness to set limits to what learning and industry may yet effect in these darker regions, the popular reader may well be excused from intrusting himself to the labyrinth, till the clew has been found by more adventurous spirits.

But do the sayings and doings of Chaucer thus fall beyond the pale of general interest; does his image thus shrink into the shadowy past? Nothing can be more erroneous than such a supposition, and indeed, so far is his story from being strange and distant to us, that we believe every one who investigates it for the first time will feel astonished that it should have been possible for any one, in the times of Cressy and of Poitiers, to lead a life in all respects so nearly resembling that of an accomplished and successful civilian at the present day. It may make us think better of the liberality of our ancestors also, when we find that among iron-coated warriors and hooded monks, there was one who was neither a soldier nor a priest who advanced himself to celebrity and fortune, and during a long life under three monarchs enjoyed both honour and wealth by dint of his intellectual gifts and graces alone.

It is an extremely common error, both with vulgar narrators

and careless readers, to lay hold of the points of dissimilarity between distant ages and those in which they live, to the almost total exclusion of the often much more important features of resemblance, and this error it is which has so singularly estranged us from the early history of our country. We are told, for instance, that Chaucer lived before the invention of printing, in times of the darkest Popish superstition, when men believed in alchemy and astrology, wore armour, and fought for the most part with bows and arrows; and we immediately form to ourselves the picture of a barbarous and benighted age, and of a quaint and curious, but ignorant and bigoted old man, with whom we of this generation of light can have no species of sympathy or fellowship. We forget, however, that by drawing the picture a little nearer to us we should probably have discovered many objects of far more interesting contemplation in the features of resemblance which lie hidden behind the few fantastic forms of unlikeness which have attracted our eye in the foreground, and that, in short, our superficial glance has been resting upon the rude and barren crags which jut up prominently in the distance, instead of luxuriating in the fertile valleys and sunny fields, which a closer inspection would have revealed to our view. Now, if we would approach the father of our poetry in a spirit of erect and manly, but of respectful inquiry—if we would set about investigating his life and his writings, with the view of discovering not wherein he, in common with every man in Europe of his day, differed from the men of modern times, but wherein he resembled us, not in the unchangeable features of humanity alone, but in the peculiar characteristics of race and of nation—if we would compare with our own the manners and feelings of our own ancestors, as they move before us in their domestic and familiar intercourse in his graphic delineations, we should not only become reconciled to the character of the poet himself, but we should discover that he lived among a people possessing in the highest degree those distinctive features, that sharp and prominent nationality which distinguishes the present inhabitants of England from every other people. We should discover that same joyous and exuberant reality, that hatred of “humbug” which distinguishes us now, existing alongside of those superstitious observances which we rightly attribute to that distant age; and exhibiting itself, as it has ever since done in England, in a tendency, on the part of all classes of the people, to attack falsehood by the arms of argument and ridicule, rather than by an ebullition of sudden violence, which should peril the advantages of their present position, to risk a positive good for a possible better. We should meet, in the morning of our English life, with that same spirit which now sneers in *Punch* and wrestles in the *Times*,

awake and busy with Pardoner, and monk, and mendicant, and with all that then was vicious and absurd, and we should perceive, moreover, that then, as now, it was no spirit of indiscriminate destruction—that though it was revolutionary in appearance, it was conservative at heart, and that it consequently acted with perfect consistency in permitting to stand, as we know that it did for two centuries longer, a religious system of the imperfections of which it was perfectly conscious, but the uses of which it also recognised.

Much has been done in later times to approach us to our ancestors, and the gulf which threatened to separate us from them for ever, has been bridged over by the adoption of a principle little regarded by the writers of history of the last age.* It has come to be perceived that the importance of an historical fact is often by no means in proportion to its apparent magnitude, and that the trivial occurrences of domestic life, and the usages of familiar intercourse, form very frequently a more accurate measure, both of the genius and culture of a people, than their great public events. It was long forgotten, that although trying situations may call forth striking manifestations of individual or of national peculiarities, it is in the peaceful and normal condition alone that we can hope to analyze that infinitely complex idea which corresponds to the character of a man or of an age; and that it is only when we behold it at rest and examine it in detail, that we can detect the individual colours which compose the variegated web of human life. In the hurry of a battle, or the confusion of a political revolution, in the panic of a pestilence, or the depression of a famine, men of all races, and in all ages, must manifest many features of resemblance, for this simple reason, that their actions are for the time under the dominion of necessity, or at all events of a few simple and overwhelming emotions; and to prove that their conduct had been similar in such circumstances, would be but to prove that they belonged to the common family of mankind. If their courage or their pusillanimity, their clemency or their cruelty, had been very remarkable, we should then indeed have the broad and general ideas that they were heroes or cowards, that they were men of mercy or men of blood; but as to their position on the intellectual or social scale, we should still be utterly at sea, since a barbarian may be generous, and poets and philosophers have been known who were no heroes. So long as the conduct of an individual is very powerfully influenced by the external circumstances which surround him at the time, it forms but a rude and general index to his character; and it is only when his actions proceed from

* See remarks on Robertson's Charles V. in Maitland's "Dark Ages."

the unfettered dictates of his reason or of his caprice, that its light becomes a clear and trusty guide. If we had heard the orders of Harold to his nobles, and known every circumstance of his conduct, and even every thought which passed through his mind during the battle of Hastings, we might have judged perhaps of the talents of the General, or even of the determination and energy of the man, but we should have known less of the civilisation either of him or of his age, than if we had conversed with him, as he buckled on his spurs for the battle, or had played the eves-dropper, when, in days of careless joy, he lingered by the side of the swan-necked Edith. Of all the days of Harold's life, perhaps the least instructive in this respect would have been that of the battle of Hastings.

Since the days of the learned and laborious Tyrwhitt, and the loving and enthusiastic but injudicious Goswin, numerous have been the attempts to bring us once again face to face with the father of our poetry. We have had "*Chaucer Modernized*," "*Tales from Chaucer*," "*Riches of Chaucer*," "*Selections from Chaucer*," with notes and illustrations and biographies without end, and to little good end or purpose either, so far as we can judge. They have failed one and all, for this good and simple reason, that they satisfied the requirements of no class of readers. Tiresome to the indolent for whom they were intended, they in vain endeavoured to rival with them the attractions of the slightest novel of the day; useless to the vain-glorious, for it was impossible to boast of such an acquaintance with the poet as they conveyed, and to the better class of readers, the learned and serious, not holding out even the promise of satisfaction, they fell, as might have been anticipated, nearly still-born from the press.* Possessing neither brilliancy nor depth, they came within the category of that species of easy writing which, according to Sheridan, is hard reading.

A work of far higher merit, though of far humbler pretension, is one which, under the title of "*Pictures of English Life*,"

* To "those ornaments of this civilized age, and patterns to the civilized world, the ingenious, intelligent, well-informed, and artless young women of England," to whom it seems Mr. Cowden Clarke gallantly dedicates his labours, they may, and we hope have been useful, though from what we have ourselves occasionally observed in these same ingenious and artless young ladies, we must beg leave to doubt whether such a profession was the most effectual means which might have been adopted to propitiate their favour. We believe that a professed ladies' writer, like a professed ladies' man, rarely meets with the gratitude to which he may naturally conceive himself entitled, and his productions, we fear, will run some small risk of being classed with that gratification to which a popular proverb has likened a saltless egg. That there are many passages in old Dan Chaucer unsuited for the eyes or ears of juvenile gentlewomen we most readily grant, and these we think Mr. Clarke ought quietly and unostentatiously to have omitted from a publication of the kind which he meditated.

with accompanying selections from the *Canterbury Tales*, appeared some time ago in that best of all popular series, "Knight's Weekly Volume." Its author, Mr. Saunders, is entitled to the praise of having succeeded in one little book, in doing what Godwin attempted and failed to do in two large ones, viz., in transporting us from the England of the 19th back into the England of the 14th century, in forcing us not only to acknowledge, but to *feel* our kindred with our ancestors, that blood is indeed thicker than water, and that between the English then and the English now, there is more real community than between the English and any other living people. He has succeeded, too, in preserving the vigorous and masculine, the honest and downright spirit of the great original, and the coarseness by which these marvellous tales are occasionally (and considering the time at which they were written, inevitably) disfigured, he has gently put aside, by passing over in silence the passages in which it occurs; he has taken, in short, the poet's own oft-repeated advice to "turne over the leef, and chese another tale," the only sensible course in such circumstances.

But of all the later Chaucerian labours, the most important unquestionably, though perhaps not the most attractive, is the *Memoir* by the late lamented Sir Harris Nicolas, appended to Pickering's edition of the poet. Sir Harris, who belonged, as is well known, to the incredulous, as Godwin did to the credulous school of antiquarians, proceeded by personal inspection of the sources, to verify or to refute the mass of so called facts out of which, with the frequent aid of his own too fertile imagination, that latter enthusiast had contrived to weave what he was pleased to denominate his "*Life of Chaucer*." Rejecting altogether the aid of conjecture, in which poor Godwin had so freely indulged, he determined to give us "a *Life of the Poet*, founded on documentary evidence instead of imagination;" and it will be gratifying to those who, in spite of the secret misgivings with which they must often have been visited, have striven to believe in the existence of the first of our hero-men-of-letters, as Godwin had depicted him, when they learn that from this dry and rigid detail of documentary evidence, this great spirit of the 14th century comes out more than ever in the light of a great and revered and even prosperous man.

For the benefit of those of our readers whose curiosity with regard to the poet may exceed their relish for documentary detail, and also in order that we may have an opportunity of commenting upon the errors into which that universal incredulity, which he very properly adopted as the rule of his conduct, seems occasionally to have led Sir Harris Nicolas, we shall recount, as

briefly as we can, the substance of what may now be considered as finally *discovered* regarding the life and social position of Chaucer.

Over the birth and early life of our father-poet, a cloud of mystery hangs, which, as yet, has defied the industry of his biographers. All that can be asserted with safety is, that he was born about the year 1328,—that he was of Norman descent,—that his parents were persons in easy circumstances,—and that his youth was spent in the city of London. In support of the assertion that he was of Norman race, besides the form of the name itself, which is decidedly Norman, we have the very important fact, which Sir Harris Nicolas has overlooked, of its occurring in two different copies of the "*Battel Abbey Roll*," or list of persons of note who came over to England in the train of the Conqueror.* The name seems never to have become a common one, and it is therefore extremely probable that, by the father's side, the poet was descended from the person there mentioned. But the period of more than two centuries and a half, which had elapsed between the battle of Hastings and the birth of the poet, is far too extensive to warrant us in tracing any portion, either of his individual character,† or of his fortune, to the circumstance of his Norman origin. His ancestors had no doubt intermarried with the Saxon population among whom they lived, and it is highly probable that the blood which flowed in the veins of the poet, like that of the English people generally, was much more Saxon than Norman. At the period of Chaucer's birth the prejudices of race had already in a great measure given way to the more generous feeling of national pride, and before his death the work of amalgamation, which time and a community of interests had begun, was completed by the community of antipathies which sprung up as the only permanent good fruits of the French wars of Edward III. and of his son. The only benefit which Chaucer could have derived from the Norman origin of his family, must have been a certain odour of gentility, which we know then adhered to those who bore a Norman name, and this he was altogether too sensible a man to value highly. "*Straw for your gentillesse*," was probably his own sentiment as well as that of his host; he was a man and an Englishman, and that was quite sufficient for his purpose. It is not improbable that our ignor-

* *Vide* Stow's *Chron.* in the last edition of Fuller's *Church History*, p. 105. The name also occurs in another mentioned by Fuller, as lately in the possession of Thomas Serwin, Esq.

† The personal appearance of the poet, in so far as it goes, is in favour of a Norman descent. His features, which, even in old age, would seem to have been remarkably handsome, are prominent, and the nose has that slightly aquiline form which we are accustomed to consider as the Norman type, probably for no better reason than because it belonged to the Conqueror.

ance with regard to his origin arises in a great measure from the circumstance of his pedigree having occupied a very much smaller portion of his thoughts than was usually the case with men of his time. It was neither a subject of self-gratulation nor of self-abasement; he was neither proud of it nor ashamed of it; and therefore it is that although he is very open and communicative with regard to the circumstances of his life generally, it never once occurs to him to say anything of the manner in which he was ushered into the world.

That his parents were persons in easy, if not affluent circumstances, may be safely inferred from the fact, that he certainly received a most excellent education. There is no trace of his ever having been intended for the Church, and yet there is no department of knowledge which was then cultivated, with which he does not exhibit an intimate and apparently an old standing familiarity.

Whatever may have been the place of Chaucer's birth, whether it was the city of London, or the county of Kent, which we shall afterwards see that he represented in Parliament, and with which there are many reasons to suppose that he was connected, there seems little doubt that he received the early part of his education in London. The fact, however, is by no means undisputed. The chief argument in its favour is derived from a passage in "The Testament of Love," which is adduced by Godwin and most of Chaucer's biographers as completely establishing the point; whilst by Sir Harris Nicolas, it is with equal confidence rejected, as proving nothing at all. The "Testament of Love" is an allegorical piece, composed in imitation of the celebrated work of Boethius, *De Consolatione Philosophiæ*; but in which the part of "*Philosophy*" is supplied by "*Love*," who, in a female form, appears to converse with, and console her "*Norie*" or *alumnus*. The question in dispute among the biographers is, as to how far this "*Norie*," this terrestrial interlocutor, may with safety be regarded as the poet himself; and whether the circumstances mentioned must be held to form part of the allegory, or may be construed as having reference to actual occurrences? That Godwin, with his habitual rashness, has endeavoured to make out a great deal too much, and that he has converted an imaginary Island, in which the Interlocutor is imprisoned by the allegorical personages, "*Lust*," "*Thought*," and "*Will*," into the Tower of London, in which he conceives the poet to be confined by the opponents of John of Gaunt, is beyond dispute; still it by no means follows, that, because Godwin has made an absurd blunder with regard to one passage, no part of the book shall be held to have a personal reference to the poet; or that, because Chaucer does *not mean* the "Tower of

London" when he speaks of an "allegorical island," therefore he *does* mean an "allegorical island" when he speaks of the "city of London." The passage itself is so pointed, that we cannot think of torturing it in'to any other than its natural sense. "Also the Citty of London, that is to me so dere, and swete, in whiche I was forth growen, and more kindly love have I to that place, than to any other in yerth, as every kindly creature hath full appetite to that place of his kindly engendure, and to wilne reste and pece in that stede to abide." The context is no doubt very obscure, but there is nothing in it, so far as we can see, which forbids the application of these words to the individual situation of Chaucer: and we are further confirmed in this opinion by the fact, that in the work of Boethius, the author continually speaks through the mouth of the terrestrial interlocutor. The probabilities, therefore, in our opinion, are in favour of the direct construction, and, consequently, of Chaucer's having been, if not born, at least "forth growen," in London, though we should scarcely have expected to find them giving rise to the Chapter on his "Schoolboy Amusements" which we find in Godwin.

Each of the English Universities lays claim to Chaucer as a pupil, with about equal success. That he must have studied at one of them is certain, for there then existed no other means of procuring the instruction which he possessed; and the method of solving the mystery, at which Sir H. Nicolas scouts, viz., by supposing that he was at both, seems to us by no means so absurd as he imagines. We know that it was then very common for celebrated teachers, both in England and on the Continent, to collect around them audiences drawn from every corner of Europe, and the students were a migratory population, who remained at any one University no longer than was requisite to attend on the instructions of him whose fame had brought them thither. Leland, the English Antiquary of the sixteenth century, who asserts that Chaucer was at Oxford, was a member of both Universities, and Chaucer seems to indicate a favour for the custom, where he says, that "Sondry scoles maken subtil clerkes." The English Universities had not then, and did not assume till long afterwards, that peculiar character which now belongs to them. They resembled the Universities of Paris and Bologna then, and of Germany and Scotland now; and we know that the custom of residing at two, or even three Universities, is very frequent at the present day, both on the continent of Europe and in Scotland.

It is also asserted, on still more doubtful authority, that Chaucer studied the law; and an amusing anecdote is told by Spight, of his having been fined two shillings for beating a Franciscan friar in Fleet-street, whilst he was a member of the

Inner Temple. We are further told that he travelled in France for his instruction. But with reference to all of these assertions, the question will naturally arise, whether they were not brought forward by their authors, in order to account for the acquirements of which the poet was no doubt possessed when he first comes within the range of historical vision. If a man knows French well, as he seems to have done, it is no doubt highly probable that he may have been partially educated in France; but it is not a sufficient ground upon which to assert that such has actually been the case, since the fact would be equally well accounted for by his mother having been a French woman, or a hundred other accidental circumstances.

All that can be positively affirmed of Chaucer up to the year 1359, when he was in the army which invaded France, and when, according to the date which is usually given to his birth, he must have been 31 years of age, is that he received the best education which could be obtained at the time, and that he probably was intended for a learned profession, since his studies would not otherwise have been carried so far at a time when learning was so rarely cultivated by laymen for its own sake.

The account which we possess of his first and only military service, is contained in a deposition which he himself gave on the 15th October 1387, as a witness for Sir Richard le Scrope, in defence of his right to the arms "azure a bend or" against the claim of Sir R. Grosvenor. Chaucer was then attending upon the Parliament, as knight of the shire for the county of Kent. His deposition, which is extremely curious, we shall insert for the amusement of our readers.

"Geffray Chaucere, Esquier, del age de xl. ans et plus, armez par xxvij. ans, produit par la partie de Mons. Richard Lescrope, jurez et examinez :

"Demandez, si les armez d'azure ove une bende dor apparteynent, ou de-yvent apparteyner, au dit Mons. Richard du droit et de heritage, dist,

"Que oil, qar il lez ad veu estre armez en France devant la ville de Retters, et Mons. Henry Lescrope armoz en mesmes les armez ove un label blanc et a baner, et le dit Mons. Richard armez en les entiers armez d'azure ove une bende dor, et issint il lez vist armer partout le dit viage, tanque le dit Geffrey estoit pris :

"Demandez, par qui il seiet que les ditz armez apparteynent au dit Mons. Richard, dist,

"Que par oy dire des veu Chivalers et Esquiers," &c. &c.

The following anecdote is curious :—

"Qil estoit une foitz en Friday Strete en Londres, com il alast en la rewe il vist pendant hors un nouvell signe faitz dez diz armez, et demandast quele herbergerie ceo estoit qui avoit pendu hors certez

armez du Scrop, et un autr luy repondist et dit, Neny!, seigneur, ils ne sont myz penduz hors pour les armez de Scrope, ne depeynte la pour cez armez, mes ils sont depeynte et mys la por une Chivaleir del Counte de Chestre, que homme appell Mons. Robert Grovenor; et ceo fuist les primer faitz que oonges il oiaist parler de Mons. Robert Grovenor ou de cez auncestres, ou de ascun autre portant le nom de Grovenor."

It would be extremely interesting to know in what capacity Chaucer actually served in this memorable expedition. The term "armed" by no means sets the question at rest, for he says that he was armed for twenty-seven years, during which time we know that he filled a succession of civil offices, and never once acted in the capacity of a soldier. It applies also to the time of giving the deposition, when he was certainly altogether a civilian. Perhaps it referred merely to the rank of esquire, which he then possibly for the first time assumed, or obtained. Strongly confirmatory as it seems to us of the view that Chaucer was attached to the army of Edward in a civil capacity, is the circumstance, that the next mention we have of him is in the situation of one of the "Valets of the King's Chamber," or "Valet of the King's Household," as the office is elsewhere called; and on the 20th June 1367, the king grants him, by the designation of "dilectus Valettus noster," in consideration of his *former* and future services, an annual salary of twenty marks for life, or until he should be otherwise provided for. From 1360 to 1367, no entry of any payment to him appears on the Issue Roll of the Exchequer, so that he probably held during that time no recognised public office; but the mention of his former services evidently implies a previous connexion with the Court, and nothing is more likely than that they may have stretched back to the date of the expedition. His being taken prisoner, of course proves nothing, for this might have befallen a civil as well as a military servant of the king, though it is very possible that the captivity which he suffered may have been reckoned among his services; and that its duration may account for some portion of the time during which, after once appearing, he again escapes from our sight. His appearance at Court in a situation which, as Sir H. Nicolas says, "was always filled by gentlemen," at a time when the requisite of birth was more indispensable than even now to Court preferment, is also favourable to the opinion that he was from the first of gentle blood, and that, though he gave himself little trouble about the matter, there were others who read the "Battel Abbey Roll" in his behalf.

Chaucer's marriage is probably to be ascribed to the period at which we have now arrived. His wife was Philippa Roet, one of the "demoiselles," or ladies in attendance on the queen, and

the eldest daughter of Sir Payne Roet, a native of Hainault, and king of arms of Guienne. She was also the sister of Katherine, the widow of Sir Hugh Swynford, who at one time was the mistress, and afterwards became the wife, of John of Gaunt. This, like most of the other facts of Chaucer's life, has been the subject of dispute, but we may now regard it as finally set at rest, by the investigations of Sir Harris Nicolas. The exact period of his marriage is not mentioned, but it must have taken place before the 12th September, 1366, since on that day a pension of ten marks annually, for life, was granted to "*Philippa Chaucer una Domicellarum Camere Philippæ Reginae Angliæ.*" Chaucer's wife was, therefore, a *Domicella* before he was, or at least is known to have been, a *Valetus*, and it is not improbable that his connexion with her may have led to his procuring that office. Philippa, after her marriage with the poet, continued in the service of the queen, and at Christmas 1368, she is mentioned as one of the persons of the royal household to whom robes were ordered to be given. Her name occurs along with those of twelve other "*damoiselles*," eight "*sous damoiselles*," and several "*veillereses*" of the queen's chamber, and among these latter is Philippa Pycard, the person whom several of the biographers suppose to have been the wife of Chaucer. There is reason to believe that Sir Payne Roet came to England in the retinue of Queen Philippa, in 1328, and it is therefore probable that his daughter entered the royal household at an early period of life. We have no means of ascertaining her age when she was united to the poet, but unless the marriage took place some time before the pension was assigned to her, her husband must then have been at least thirty-five, and as it is not likely that she was much older, we may conclude that she was born after her father's arrival in England.

After the queen's death, in 1369, Philippa Chaucer was attached to the person of Constance of Castile, Duchess of Lancaster, the second consort of John of Gaunt, to whose children, by his first alliance, her younger sister, Katherine, Lady Swynford, was then governess. Like her husband, she seems to have enjoyed the favour of "the great duke," for, before August 1372, he had given her a pension of £10^s per annum, which was commuted, in June 1374, for an annuity of the same amount to her and her husband for life, "in consideration of the good services which they had rendered to the duke, to his duchess, and to the late queen, his mother." In 1382, the Duke of Lancaster presented her with a silver-gilt cup and cover, as a new year's gift, and the record of this donation shows that she was then one of the three ladies in attendance on the duchess, the others being Lady Sanche Blount and Lady Blanche de Trumpington.

Such is pretty nearly all that has been discovered of her who shared the joys and the sorrows of Chaucer, and who, as we shall see, was the mother of his children. We would gladly know more, but on this, as on many other occasions, we must feel grateful for knowledge which, though meagre in itself, so considerably exceeds that which we possess of the private history of a greater poet than he, and one who lived so much nearer to our time. Of Shakspeare's wife, the name of "Anne Hathaway" is nearly all which his biographers are privileged to record.*

We have now to contemplate Chaucer in an altogether different capacity, and in one which has very generally, though not very reasonably, been supposed to be inconsistent with the character of a poet. We have seen him a student and a courtier. We are now to behold him immersed in affairs—a man of business! On the 20th June, 1370, he obtained the usual letters of protection, in order that he might go abroad in the service of the king. This, so far as we know, was the first of Chaucer's foreign missions: the object of it has not been ascertained; but he must have discharged his duties to the satisfaction of his sovereign, for his services were soon again called into requisition, and he was sent into foreign parts *at least seven times*† in the public service. The second of these missions is the most celebrated, from his referring to an anecdote supposed to be connected with it in the *Canterbury Tales*. The commission for this embassy was dated on the 12th November 1372, and Chaucer being then one of the king's esquires, was joined in it with James Pronam and John de Mari, citizens of Genoa, for the purpose of choosing some port in England where the Genoese might form a commercial establishment. It seems that he went to Florence, as well as Genoa, for on his return, in February 1374, he received a payment at the Exchequer for his expenses while on the king's service at these places. Godwin, and several of the other biographers, assert, that on this occasion he visited Petrarch at Padua, and obtained from him, then and there, the pathetic tale of Griselda. The anecdote, which, if true, would be highly interesting, unfortunately rests upon no higher authority than the possibility

* As regards Chaucer's relation to the gentler sex in general, there is one passage in his writings which deserves to be noticed. In the Prologue to the "*Rime of Sire Thopas*," the host, when speaking of the poet, says,—

"This were a popet in an arme to embrace
For any woman, small and faire of face."

And from this, which was the opinion of himself, by a man not remarkable for vanity, taken in conjunction with what we know of his marriage, it may be inferred with little danger of error, that fortune, along with her other favours, dealt to him no stinted share of womanly affection, and that, in common with most of those who have been greatly gifted, he had the still more enviable privilege of being greatly beloved.

† Some say nine times.

that such a meeting may have taken place, and the supposed allusion to it in the following lines in the Prologue to the Clerk's Tale :—

“ I wol you tell a tale, which that I
 Lerned at Padowe of a worthy clerk,
 As preved by his wordes and his werk.
 He is now ded, and nailed in his cheste,
 I pray to God so yeve his soule rest.
 Fraunceis Petrark, the lauret poete,
 Highte this clerk, whos retorike swete
 Enlumined all Itaille of poetrie.”

If Chaucer had not appeared in his own person as one of the characters in the Pilgrimage, and recited one of the tales, there would then have been very strong reasons for identifying his character with that of the Clerk of Oxenford, and the internal evidence in favour of this interesting meeting might have sufficed to supply the deficiency of external proof. As it is, however, notwithstanding the fact of Chaucer's having actually been at Florence while Petrarch was at Arqua, (for the discovery of which we are indebted to Sir Harris Nicolas, and which, if it had been known to Godwin, would have been pounced upon as a positive windfall,) we cannot regard the story in a higher light than that in which Sir Harris puts it when he says, that “until accident brings some hitherto undiscovered document to light, it must remain among the many doubtful circumstances in the lives of eminent men which their admirers wish to believe true, but for which their biographers ought to require surer evidence than what Godwin calls ‘coincidences which furnish a basis of historical probability.’”

Our space does not permit us to enumerate the subsequent diplomatic services of the poet. They were all of them, however, on affairs of importance, and frequently of secrecy, which renders it difficult to trace their object, or even to ascertain their number, as on these occasions neither commissions nor letters of protection were given, and the fact of their having taken place is only ascertained by payments to Chaucer from the Exchequer for services rendered “in secretis negotiis domini regis.” One, however, is mentioned by Froissart, in which Chaucer was joined in February 1377, with Sir Guichard d'Angle (afterwards Earl of Huntingdon) and Sir Richard Sturry, to negotiate a secret treaty for the marriage of Richard, Prince of Wales, with Mary, daughter of the King of France. On most of these occasions, as on that to which we have just alluded, he was associated with persons of more exalted rank—a circumstance which has led Saunders to form the very natural conjecture that he was in

truth the working man of the embassy, and acted in the capacity of what would now be called *chargé d'affaires*.*

But another and much more prosaic occupation engaged the attention of the poet when in England. On the 8th June 1374, shortly after his return from his first mission to Italy, he was appointed Comptroller of the Customs, and Subsidy of "Wools, Skins, and tanned Hides," in the port of London, and this office he continued to hold for twelve years, though he was bound to write the rolls of his office with his own hand, to be continually present, and to perform his duties personally and not by deputy, excepting of course the occasions on which he was sent abroad in the King's service. On the 8th May 1382, he was farther appointed Comptroller of the Petty Customs in the port of London, but the duties of this latter office he was permitted to discharge either in person or by sufficient deputy, and on the 17th of the following February, he was accordingly permitted to appoint a permanent deputy. It is amusing to remark, in connexion with Chaucer's first appointment to the Customs, that about the same time he received a grant of a pitcher of wine daily for life, to be received in the port of London by the hands of the King's butler. Perhaps his royal master may have been of opinion that after a day spent in those "rekenynges," of which he gently insinuates his aversion in his *House of Fame*, a "cup of sack" would be no unwelcome refreshment to a poet.

But though we may imagine that the kindness of his sovereign may have been called into exercise on this occasion, by a sense of the uninteresting nature of the poet's occupations, we can by no means join with Tyrwhitt in his lamentation for the genius of Chaucer, when struggling against the petrifying effect of these Custom-house accounts. We believe, on the contrary, that much of that peculiarly healthy and normal character which belongs to Chaucer's mind, as exhibited in his poetry, is to be attributed to his having taken so large a share in the actual business of the world. To procure the means of living in ease and affluence by the exercise of moderate, though regular application, has seldom a deteriorating effect on the mind of any man, and the time which was engrossed by these occupations was probably saved from his passing amusements and his gossiping friends, rather than taken from that which would have been devoted to posterity. The Excise has perhaps been charged with more than its own share in the destruction of Robert Burns, and the India House

* It is worthy of remark, that in 1378, when he was sent to Lombardy, Chaucer appointed his friend and brother poet *Gower*, along with a certain Richard Forrester, to represent him in any legal proceedings which might be instituted in his absence.

may claim the merit of having saved Charles Lamb from the heaviest of human afflictions. We regard it as a proof at once of the "manysidedness" of Chaucer's mental endowments, and of the thorough manliness of his character, that whilst he acted as the spiritual exponent of his age—whilst he felt and responded to the highest of earthly vocations—he was at the same time both able and willing to discharge, and did actually discharge, long and assiduously, the ordinary duties of an English citizen. Nor is the instance a solitary one among the greatest poets. Milton was Latin Secretary to Cromwell, and took an active share in all the events of his time; Shakspeare realized a fortune by his "Globe Theatre;" Goethe was Prime Minister to the Duke of Weimar; and if Shelley, Byron, and Keates, and the rest of our morbid poets, had been forced to think a little more of other people and a little less of themselves, there would probably have been less of that fretful repining and subjective mewling by which they have disgraced both themselves and their calling.

Towards the end of 1386, Chaucer ceased to hold his offices in the Customs, and great has been the ingenuity which his biographers have exhibited in accounting for his supposed dismissal. Godwin, who never leaves anything unexplained, discovered, as he says, from passages in the "Testament of Love," or more properly speaking invented, a very ingenious and romantic story of his having taken part in the dispute between the Court and the citizens of London, respecting the election of a certain mayor of the name of John of Northampton; of his having fled to Zealand; of his there having acted with great liberality to his fellow-exiles; of the persons who had charge of his affairs in his absence having betrayed their trust and reduced him to poverty; of his having betrayed his confederates in return, in order to get out of the Tower of London, in which it seems he was imprisoned on his return, and a great many circumstances of a similar description, which, though highly creditable to the inventor, would not probably be greatly to the edification of our readers. The whole of this mass of "historical probabilities" is now blown in the air by the discovery, that, during the whole time of his supposed exile, Chaucer was quietly discharging his Custom-House duties in London, and drawing his salaries; and that, at the very time when he is supposed to have been lying a prisoner in the Tower of London, he was sitting as Knight of the Shire for the county of Kent in the Parliament at Westminster! The discovery is of course a notable one, and Sir Harris Nicolas glorifies himself accordingly. But the odd part of the business is, that although he has thus pulled down the whole of the superincumbent mass of rubbish which Godwin had built upon the theory of the dismissal, he still

continues to be haunted by the theory itself. Why does it never occur to him, that if Chaucer became a Member of Parliament on the 1st October, and ceased to be Comptroller of the Customs on the 1st December, the two events may possibly have been connected, and that the resignation of the comptrollership may have been occasioned by its duties being incompatible with those of a member of Parliament? The explanation seems so natural, that one wonders why it should have failed to suggest itself. But what, then, became of the theory of the dismissal? It went by the board of course; and this Sir Harris would by no means permit, for he (in common with Godwin, strange to tell) was determined that Chaucer should be poor at one period of his life; and the present seemed a favourable opportunity for commencing his misfortunes. We are told, accordingly, that although the accession of Richard II. had been favourable to him at first, from the power which it placed in the hands of his patron, the Duke of Lancaster, the tide had now turned against him, and that he had become obnoxious to the Duke of Gloucester, who had then risen into power. For this there is just as little proof as for the exile to Zealand. It is very possible that a change of ministers may have led to the poet's retirement from his offices in the Customs, and a similar circumstance may have induced him voluntarily to assign his pensions—a transaction which has been held as a sure indication of his being in pecuniary difficulties. In any view of this matter, the facts seem to us by no means necessarily to infer poverty; they are equally explicable on the supposition of his having attained to such affluence as to render it no longer indispensable that he should discharge the functions of laborious offices; and, however improbable it may be that a poet should be industrious, if we have the industry proved, as in the case before us, we think the supposition of its having been followed by its usual concomitant of easy circumstances, even in his case, ceases to be extravagant. The death of his wife, moreover, which seems to have taken place in 1387, by adding the element of domestic affliction to the other inducements to retirement which must always have weighed with a man of letters, renders the voluntary withdrawal of Chaucer from public affairs, at this period of his life, still more intelligible. We are confirmed in our opinion, moreover, by the fact, that he never again held any public office the duties of which he was compelled to discharge in person. In 1389, when the young king Richard II. assumed the reins of government, and the poet's patron, John of Gaunt, and his son, the Earl of Derby, (afterwards King Henry IV.), came into power, he was appointed to the valuable office of Clerk of the King's Works at the Palace of Westminster and

the other Royal Residences, but his duties he was permitted to discharge by deputy, and, even if he had not, they were probably more to his taste than those of Comptroller of Customs. This situation Chaucer held for two years; and the cause of his resignation, or dismissal, as in the former case, is unknown. For a short time he seems to have had no other pension than that which he derived from the Duke of Lancaster, and his wages as one of the King's Esquires. But on the 28th February 1394, he again obtained a grant from the King of £20 for life; and this fact, taken in connexion with the powerful friendships which we know he possessed, and the very recent period at which, as Clerk of the Works, he must have been very well off, renders it, to our thinking, rather a hasty conclusion on the part of his biographers, that he must have been in great want of money, merely because he seems, once or twice, to have anticipated his pension at the Exchequer. The truth of the matter probably is, that he made the Exchequer serve him in some measure as a banker—that he treated his pension as an account-current, upon which he drew as he found occasion for his ordinary expenses; and this view we think is confirmed by the fact, that he allowed it to lie after the term of payment, nearly as often as he drew it in advance. On the whole, we conceive that the attempt to make Chaucer a martyr to the world's forgetfulness of men of genius, has not very well prospered in the hands of his biographers; and we think it not unlikely, that the phantom of poverty with which they have insisted on marring his fortunes, may have been conjured up by that which overshadowed their own. On this subject Sir Harris Nicolas is quite as pathetic as Godwin; and the similarity of his fate, which we have recently had occasion to deplore, with that which so long pressed upon the indiscreet but gifted author of *Caleb Williams*, may not improbably have brought about this solitary coincidence. Nor are we at all shaken in our opinion on this subject by Chaucer's address "to his Emptie Purse," which has been relied on as an additional proof of his poverty. It is manifestly a sportive production, written for the purpose of bringing his claims for an increase of his pensions in a light and graceful manner before the young king, Henry IV., the son of his patron, John of Gaunt, and with whom, be it remembered, he was then nearly connected by marriage, and in these circumstances the expressions, "I am sorrie now that ye be light," "be heavy againe," &c., seem to us nothing more than what we daily hear from persons in very easy circumstances. They might be brought forward as a proof of his avarice, quite as well as of his poverty. But if he was a needy, he seems not to have been an unsuccessful suitor, for we know that within four days after Henry came

to the throne, and probably the very day that he received the verses in question, he doubled the poet's pension, and on the 15th of October of the preceding year, just at the time when his supposed penury must have been at its height, he obtained in addition to his daily pitcher, another grant of a tun of wine every year during his life, "in the port of London, from the King's chief butler or his deputy."* If he had been so "rascally poor" as his biographers would make him, one would think that the *pitcher*† daily ought to have been sufficient for his consumption in the article of wine. That Chaucer was extravagant, or at least that he possessed those expensive tastes which so frequently accompany intellectual refinement, is extremely probable, and if such were the case it is not unlikely that his purse was occasionally "lighter" than was consistent with his habits; but we rejoice to think that there is no reason for quarrelling with the buxom age in which he lived, on the score of his having been subjected to actual want, and so far are we from wishing to claim for him the glories of pecuniary martyrdom, that we confess to regarding with some degree of pleasure, the many indications of wealth and comfort with which at every stage of his life we find him surrounded. We remember that Knox had "his pipe of Bordeaux in that old Edinburgh house of his," and we remember also the flagon of Einbecker beer, which the kind hands of Duke Erich proffered to Doctor Martin Luther, on his exit from the *Saale* at Worms, and the gratitude with which he drank it; and neither the one nor the other of these hero-priests is one whit the less heroic in our eyes from his hearty enjoyment of the good things which Providence sent him. We have every reason to believe that the father of our poets was considerably more fortunate in external circumstances than either of the Reformers, and we have no reason to doubt that his enjoyments were tempered with the same kindly and pious spirit.

But Chaucer was not destined long to enjoy the bounty of his new sovereign, for he died at the mature age of 72, on the 15th October 1400, only one year subsequent to the grants which we have last mentioned. He died in the vicinity of Westminster, in a house which on the Christmas Eve preceding he had rented from a monk of the name of Robert Humodesworth. Whether London was then the place of his habitual residence, whether he possessed, as has been said, the castle and manor of Donington, in Berkshire, or passed the latter part of his life at a favourite

* It is instructive on this subject to remark that a few months subsequent to this grant, if not at the very time, the King's chief butler was none other than the poet's own son, Thomas Chaucer.

† A pitcher of wine is supposed to have amounted to four bottles.

retreat at Woodstock, cannot now be, or at all events has not yet been, ascertained with certainty, though considerably greater industry has been bestowed upon the inquiry than in the eyes of many it may seem to merit.

In his family Chaucer was not less fortunate than in the other circumstances of his life, and his name was preserved in honour among the living by his eldest son Thomas Chaucer, who externally was a more important personage than even the poet himself. In the reign of Richard II., while his father yet lived, he had held the office of King's chief butler, and a grant of twenty marks a year had also been given to him. Under Henry IV. he held many lucrative and honourable appointments; he represented Oxfordshire in eight Parliaments, commencing with the year 1402, and coming down to 1429, and in 1414 he was chosen Speaker of the Commons in the Parliament that met at Westminster, on Monday after the octaves of St. Martin. Thomas Chaucer married Matilda, the second daughter and co-heiress of Sir John Burghersh, with whom he acquired large estates in Oxfordshire, and in many other counties, and latterly he seems to have been very wealthy, since he is rated after his death, in the list which was prepared of those of whom it was proposed to borrow money for carrying on the French war, at a much larger sum than any other person except the Bishops of Exeter and Ely, the Dean of Lincoln, and Sir John Cornwall. He served with the King in France with a retinue of twelve men-at-arms, and thirty-seven archers, and he was present at the battle of Agincourt. Like his father he seems also to have had a talent for diplomacy, for he was frequently employed as an ambassador during the reigns of Henry IV., Henry V., and Henry VI.

Thomas Chaucer had only one child, Alice Chaucer, who married for the third time, in 1430, William de la Pole, Earl, and afterwards Duke of Suffolk, who was attainted and beheaded in 1450. By him she had three children, the eldest of whom, John de la Pole, Duke of Suffolk, married the Princess Elizabeth Plantagenet, sister of King Edward IV., by whom he had a numerous family, the eldest of whom, John de la Pole, was declared by Richard III. heir-apparent to the throne, in the event of the Prince of Wales dying without issue; so that for some time, as Sir Harris Nicolas remarks, there was a great probability of the poet's great-great-grandson succeeding to the Crown. But the Earl of Lincoln (for such he had been created in his father's lifetime) was killed in the not very glorious battle of Stoke in 1487, and in his person the family of Chaucer was extinguished, thus suffering the fate which strangely enough seems to impend over the families of all our poets.

Besides his son Thomas, Chaucer probably had a daughter and also a sister of the name of Elizabeth, since two persons bearing the name of Elizabeth Chaucer became nuns, one in the Abbey of Berking in Essex, and the other in the priory of St. Helen's, London, in such circumstances as to lead to the supposition that they were connected with the Poet.

But of all his children, the most interesting, because apparently the best beloved, is "*lytel Lowys*," for whose instruction he compiled, and to whom he dedicated his "*conclusions of the Astrolabie*" in a style so quaint, so tender, and withal so instructive with reference both to his own character and to the time, that though intended for no other purpose than to facilitate the studies of a child of ten years old, it has become to us one of the most interesting of his works.

The object of the treatise is to reduce to a simpler form the rules for the use of this instrument, which till the invention of the quadrant, was invariably used both in astronomy and navigation, and to present them in English to his son, instead of the latin in which it was then the custom to teach them, "*for latine ne canst thou nat yet but smale, my litel some.*" It is "*compownded*," as he tells us, "*after the latitude of Oxenforde*," where it is probable that "*lytel Lowys*" was then at school, and where his father had evidently perceived with delight the opening of powers which we have reason to believe were not destined to arrive at maturity. With a mixture of fondness and of pride which is touching, he says, "*I perceive by certain evidences, thyne abylyte to lerne seyncees, touching nombres, and proportions, and also well consider I thy besye prayer in especyal to lerne the trefyse of the astrolabye.*" The conclusion of the dedication is also well worthy of note, both for the quaint modesty with which he lays aside all pretension to scientific originality, and for the patriotic enthusiasm with which he speaks of the English language:—

"Now wol I pray mekely every person discrete, that redeth or heareth this litel treatise to have my rude entending excused, and my superfluite of wordes, for two causes. The firste cause is, for that curious endityng and harde sentences is ful hevy at once, for such a childe to lerne. And the seconde cause is this, that sothely me semeth better to writen unto a child twise a good sentence, than he foriete it ones. And Lowis, if it so be that I shewe the in my lith Englishe, as true conclusions touching this mater, and not only as trewe but as many and subtil conclusions, as bene yshewed in latin, in any comon treatise of the astrolabye, comen me the more thanke, and praye God save the kinge, that is lorde of this langage, and all that him faith beareth, and obeith everich in his degre, the more and the lasse. But consydre thwell, that I ne usurpe not to have

founden this werke of my labour or of mine engin. I nam but a leude compilatour of the laboure of old astrologiens, and have it translated in myn Englishe onely for thy doctrine, and with this swerde shall I sleue envy."

This little tribute of paternal love on the part of our poet, is indeed remarkable in many ways, and if we consider the time at which it was written, when universality of knowledge was of much less easy attainment than in our day, and bear in mind further, that it was the fruit of the leisure hours of one, who besides his literary labours, which were neither few nor small, was as we have seen a courtier, a diplomatist, and a man of business, it will hold as such a prominent place among the curiosities of literature. Of its bearing in another point of view, we shall have to speak in a subsequent page.

We have now concluded what we conceived it needful to say of the external position of Chaucer, and of his varied career, and it will probably be admitted that we have in some measure fulfilled the promise with which we commenced the recital. We have called from the fourteenth century as a witness to its manners, one who neither in his occupations, nor in his fortunes, differed greatly from hundreds of the best class of Englishmen of the present time, and whose story, in its external aspect, might be told of many under the reign of Queen Victoria, as well as under that of King Edward III. Are we to conclude from this, that Chaucer was a solitary and isolated character, plucked as it were by anticipation from the realm of the future, and sent as a spectator for our behoof into the halls of our ancestors? or are we to accept him as a specimen of the man of his time, at the expense of foregoing all our preconceived opinions with reference to the character of the fourteenth century? On either hypothesis we should be equally in error; solitary and isolated he certainly was not, for with all that was acted, and all that was thought, he was entwined; in his life and in his character he was the expression of his time; but neither was he an average specimen, for he was its highest expression; we do not say that he was before his time, for though the phrase is often used with reference to those whose development surpasses that of their contemporaries not in kind but in degree, we do not think that it is rightly so used, and if there was any one of that day to whom in its proper signification we might apply it, it would be to Wycliffe, and not to Chaucer. Chaucer did not anticipate the future, but he comprehended the present, he was a "seer" of what was—not of what was to be. He was the "clear and conscious" man of his time. In his opinions there was nothing which others did not feel, but what they felt unconsciously he thought

and expressed, and what to them was a vapour, to him was a form. There was no antagonism between him and his age, and hence the popularity which we know that he enjoyed. In taking this view of the matter, it may be thought that we give up all pretension on the part of our poet, to the highest—the prophetic part of the poetic character. We answer that we are not here to discuss the question, as to whether the proper function of the poet is to express the age in which he lives, or to shadow forth an age which is to follow. We state the fact as we conceive it to be, and so important do we regard it in order to a just appreciation of the character and influence of Chaucer, that we shall take the liberty of illustrating it by tracing it out as well as we may, first in his philosophy, and then in his religion.

For this purpose it is not necessary that we should speak at length of his metaphysical creed, for the philosophy of Aristotle was still all-prevalent; and there is abundant proof in many parts of his writings that Chaucer, like the rest of the learned of his day, was brought up at the feet of the Stagyrte, and that he read it with the light which the Schoolmen afforded. It is probable also that the study was a very favourite one with him, that he “hadde unto logic long ygo,” and that in this, as in many other respects, he painted his own character in that of the “Clerk of Oxenford,” when he says, that

“him was liever han at his bed’s head
A twenty bookes cloth’d in black or red
Of Aristotle and his philosophy
Than robès rich, or fiddle, or psaltry.”

But there is no reason to think that in this department Chaucer ever assumed a higher position than that of a recipient. In none of his works that have come down to us does he deal with the pure intelligence; and, indeed, from his whole character, it is obvious that his interest in the concrete was so intense as scarcely to admit of his lingering long in the regions of metaphysical or logical abstraction. The part of our nature with which he was concerned, and upon which it was his vocation to act, was precisely that which the logician excludes from his view; as a poet, he had to deal with man not as he thinks merely, but as he feels and acts—with his passions and affections even more than with his intelligence, and hence his devotion to ethical studies.

Of the manner in which he studied, and endeavoured to elaborate this latter department of mental philosophy, we are fortunately enabled to judge with considerable precision. In early life he translated the celebrated work of Boethius “*De Consolatione Philosophiæ*,” a book more remarkable for its fortunes than even for its merits. • Composed in prison when accused of the

crime of having "hoped for the restoration of Roman liberty," by him whom Gibbon has characterized as "the last of the Romans whom Cato or Tully could have acknowledged for their countryman," it formed as it were the connecting link between the classical and the Christian world; and the labour of translation which Chaucer performed, had already occupied the leisure of Alfred, and was yet to engage that of Elizabeth. Though Boethius was a Christian, and his quarrel with Theodoric is supposed to have arisen from a treatise which he published during his Consulship in 522, in which he maintained the doctrine of the Unity of the Trinity, in opposition to the Arian tenets of his master, the arguments by which he seems to have consoled himself for the loss of his greatness, and to have prepared himself for the death which he soon after suffered, are deduced from the doctrines of Plato, of Aristotle, and, above all, of Zeno, rather than from those of Christ and his disciples; and if the book is to be regarded in a higher light than that of a philosophical pastime, by which he sought to relieve the tedium of captivity, it must be viewed as the production of one in whom the character of the heathen philosopher preponderated over that of the Christian martyr. It possesses, however, much of the calm and dignified beauty which the ancients shed over their natural religion. In many passages we feel as if we were reading a Latin translation of one of the Dialogues of Plato, or had stumbled by accident on an unknown passage of one of Cicero's philosophical treatises: but the freshness is gone, the clearness and precision is wanting, the style is verbose, and the argument inconsequent, and we arrive at last at the conclusion, that the author intended it as an imitation of those writings with which we know, from his early studies, that he must have been conversant. Be this as it may, the work enjoyed a popularity, and exerted an influence over the better minds of the Middle Ages, beyond that of any other writing—a circumstance which will hardly astonish us if we remember that to most of those by whom it was so eagerly read, the sources from which it was derived were unknown, and that it was consequently in its pages that they first became acquainted with the flattering doctrine, that man by the exercise of reason becomes superior to the dominion of fortune. The singular destiny which attended the philosophy of the Stoics is worthy of remark as illustrating the influence which Boethius exerted on the Middle Age. Wherever their tenets appear, it is continually as a vain protest against existing corruption, feeble for present good, but full of power and of meaning for a time which is soon to follow. When Zeno first promulgated his doctrines, they were addressed to Greece, distracted by scepticism, and enervated by Epicureanism, and the Apostle of Virtue taught in vain. Greece was past

recovery, but the rival which was to supplant her listened with eagerness to the lessons to which she was deaf, and the stern philosophy of the porch found an expression in the energy and simplicity of Roman life. During the youth and vigour of the Republic, Stoicism was peculiarly the philosophy of Rome, recognised in theory and illustrated in practice; and it was not till virtue herself had departed under the relaxing and deadening influence of the empire, that it ceased to be regarded. But here, as in Greece, when corruption and effeminacy had reached their culminating point, it reappeared in the shape of a warning spirit, and though the words of Boethius, like those of Zeno, fell unheeded on the ears of his countrymen, they found, like his, an audience among a people who flourished on the ruins of those to whom they were originally addressed. It has been said that Zeno had a presentiment of the stern simplicity of Rome, and with equal truth it might be said that Boethius had a presentiment of the romantic and truth-loving devotion of the Middle Ages.

But though Chaucer inherited the ethical code of Boethius, he was not contented with the character of a simple inheritor. He endeavoured to adapt what he found in a Roman dress, or in Roman tatters, to the uses and modes of thinking of his countrymen, and hence in the curious treatise which is called his "Testament of Love," we have a complete embodiment of the practical philosophy of the chivalrous ages. The book is obscure and perplexing in the highest degree, full of quaint allegory, digressions, and repetitions, totally devoid of system, distressingly verbose, and still more distressingly long, so as almost to set at defiance the puny efforts of modern perseverance; still it evidently contains much that is important, and if thoroughly read, we are satisfied would reveal in its details many very interesting views hitherto overlooked, of the habits of thinking which then prevailed. The main features which distinguish it from the work of Boethius, and which stamp it as a production of the Middle Age, are easily seized. The place of philosophy, the celestial consoler, is supplied by "*Love*," a being whom we must in nowise confound either with the heathen goddess, or as some have done, with the divine love of the Christian religion. She is neither more nor less than the embodiment of an abstract idea which formed the central point of the whole system of chivalry, and her substitution for the philosophy or reason of Boethius is very characteristic of a state of society in which the affections and passions, rather than the intelligence, were the motive principles. The "*Love*" of Chaucer is a complete generalization, altogether independent of individual object, and the consolation which she proffers to her votary is that of enlisting

in his favour the special guardian, the "Margarite" who is supposed to watch over his individual fortunes. The "Margarite" seems to correspond to the chivalrous idea of the "Lady love" in its purest sense, when its reference to an individual was by no means indispensable, but when it signified rather the "love of woman," the highest object of the knight's ambition. Under the protection of this guardian spirit the lover is represented as altogether sheltered from the caprices of Fortune, and in her name he has a dose of rather frigid comfort administered to him, greatly resembling that which Boethius receives at the hand of Philosophy. Such is the general idea of the book, and it is a noble idea, embracing the very essence of society as it existed then, and presenting a much deeper view of that singular institution of chivalry than is usually to be met with in the writers either of that or of later times. Of the imperfections of its execution we have already spoken perhaps more strongly than we ought, but when placed side by side with the treatise of Boethius, from which it is professedly imitated, its inferiority as a work of art is very apparent. The one may very aptly be compared to a bright sunny day in the end of October, when much of the richness of vegetation still lingers though its vitality be gone, whilst the other resembles an arid day in March, when through the biting east winds of our northern spring, we with difficulty distinguish the germs of life which are soon to burst forth into luxuriant summer.

We have said that in his religion, as well as in his philosophy, Chaucer was the expression of his time. Though it is well known that both by his interests and his sympathies he was all along united with the reforming party in the Church, we fear that we cannot claim for him the epithet of a reformer in the sense in which it unquestionably belongs to Wycliffe. From his early translation of the "Roman de la Rose," up to the crowning efforts of his genius in the Canterbury Tales, the corruptions of the clergy were no doubt the unceasing objects of his satire, and the baneful influence which their vices exercised on the civil as well as the religious society of the time called forth continually his pathetic, and, we doubt not, his sincere lamentations. The biographer of Wycliffe has well remarked that "few are the evils, either in Church or in the state of society, to which the censure of Wycliffe was applied, which may not be found as the subject of satire or complaint in the poems of Chaucer." Still we must repeat he was no "thorough-going" reformer. Perhaps he was not bold enough; perhaps, with Erasmus, whose conduct in this respect was open to the same reproach, he would have said, "*non omnes ad martyriam satis habent roboris; vereor autem, ne, si quid inciderit tumultus, Petrum sim imitaturus.*" We in-

cline, however, to the opinion that the position which Chaucer held with reference to the Reformers was consistent with the honest sentiments of his heart, notwithstanding the suspicion of interestedness to which it is manifestly exposed from its coincidence with that of his great friend and patron John of Gaunt. He felt, as England and Europe felt at the time, that the hour for the downfall of the priesthood had not yet arrived, that they still had a part to play and functions to discharge in the history of the world, which in spite of their corruptions they would discharge, better or worse, and which could not with safety be intrusted to any other body of men which then existed. They were still the custodiers of nearly all the learning of the age, and it was in their community alone that civilisation as yet had found a secure and permanent resting-place, for the class of non-clerical men of letters to which he himself belonged was far too insignificant to undertake the task of preserving even secular knowledge. Though the clergy were indolent, their efforts, when they did exert themselves, were so much more in accordance with his own views of what was worthy of rational endeavour than those of the fighting and gasconading laymen of his day, that Chaucer, along with the scorn which he so unhesitatingly expressed for individual members of the body, had probably anything but a hostile feeling towards them as a class. Above all, Chaucer was a cheerful, hopeful man; some one has said that he was the "gayest and most cheerful writer of our language," and certain it is that the natural bent of his mind led him to view the sunny rather than the shady side of human affairs. He had nothing of the stern and uncompromising genius of a true reformer; humour and sarcasm are the characteristics of his satire, and for the scorching indignation of Juvenal, or the still more lofty reproof of Tacitus, we should search in vain in his pages. His temper was too gentle for condemnation, too hopeful for despair. Such shameless charlatans as the "Pardoner" he no doubt exposes most unmercifully.

"His wallet lay before him in his lappe,
Bret ful of pardon come from Rome, al hote."

• And again—

"He had a crois of laton full of stones,
And in a glass he hadde pigges bones."

But even here his love for the ludicrous continually breaks forth, and the description excites our laughter where it ought to awaken our indignation.

"A vois he hadde, as small as hath a gote,
No berde hadde he, no never non should have,
As smothe it was as it was newe shave."

This is not the manner in which Wycliffe spoke of such men as the Pardoner. Still we by no means admit that Chaucer was either a dishonest or a frivolous man. He used against corruption such weapons as he possessed, and such as, viewing the matter through the medium of his own hopeful and sanguine temper, he conceived to be needful; for there is every reason to suppose that he did not regard the amendment of the existing ecclesiastical system as hopeless, and consequently that he scarcely approved in his heart of the extreme measures which Wycliffe recommended.

In judging of the conduct of persons in the situation in which Chaucer stood with reference to the Reformers, we are often guilty of injustice by taking it for granted that the question presented itself to them in the same pure and simple form in which it comes before us. We bring together the arguments which we imagine must have been used, which to our minds are so convincing, and which we know ultimately prevailed, and we wonder that a person of common honesty, or common understanding, could have resisted their force. But whilst we thus marshal the victorious arguments which now alone have possession of the field, we forget that the question must then have been complicated by a thousand considerations and sympathies, the strength of which we are now incapable of measuring. To England at the time, the proposed Reformation was indeed a vexed question, nor did the views of the Reformers possess, as is frequently supposed, the force which novelty gives to startling revelations. For more than a century before Chaucer's time, the opposition to the corruptions of the Church had been the cause of much bloodshed in the neighbouring nations, and in his own land they had already been attacked by writers of every class. The satirical ballads which go under the name of Walter Mapes, and the so-called "political songs" of England, in Latin, Anglo-Norman and English, were in everybody's mouth, the "Malverne hilles" had already been the scene of the "ploughman's vision," and we have mentioned Chaucer's own early translation of the "Roman de la Rose." All of these works, and others which could be mentioned, and many which are forgotten, derived their point from the state of feeling which then existed with reference to the clergy, including of course the Monastic orders. As a question simply, it cannot be doubted that the subject was very familiar to Chaucer's mind; and it is perhaps in its very familiarity *as a question* that we are to look for the cause of its never having assumed a more definite form.

In this respect the poet occupies unquestionably a much less lofty position than the heroic and devoted Rector of Lutterworth, but his conduct is still altogether consistent with the

character which we have assigned him as the man of the present. The indecision under which he laboured was the characteristic of the time; and two centuries more were required before words were finally ripened into deeds, and the dreams of Wycliffe obtained their fulfilment.

It has been conjectured on very probable grounds that Chaucer enjoyed the personal friendship of the Reformer, and the Lutterworth Rector is by many supposed to have been the original of "the poure persone of a toun." To us it seems that this character of pure and simple piety is intended rather as an embodiment of Wycliffe's favourite idea of "a good preaching priest," than as a sketch of the stalwart proportions of the Reformer himself. We doubt not that among his flock at Lutterworth, Wycliffe was in his own person the brightest example of the character which Chaucer has so beautifully touched when he says—

" Wide was his parish, and houses fer asonder,
But he ne left nought for no ruin ne thonder,
In sickness and in mischief to visite
The ferrest in his parish, moche and lite,
Upon his fete, and in his hand a staf.
This noble ensample to his shepe he yaf,
That first he wrought, and afterward he taught."

But the father of the Reformation was something more than "a good preaching priest," and in the "poor parson" we find nothing of the grandeur of him who stood alone before the Oxford Convocation, like Luther at Worms; or who, when the sixteen doctors from the four orders of friars came to console him on what they thought and hoped was his death-bed, and to exhort him to renounce his errors, greeted them after a fashion which still more forcibly reminds us of the sturdy German. The anecdote is so characteristic, that we shall give it in the words of his biographer. The Reformer, reduced to the last stage of weakness, listened, we are told, silent and motionless to the address which the doctors delivered—"he then beckoned his servants to raise him in his bed; and fixing his eyes on the persons assembled, summoned all his remaining strength, as he exclaimed aloud—*I shall not die but live, and shall again declare the evil deeds of the Friars.*"

Though the fact has never been positively ascertained, the mutual connexion of Chaucer and of Wycliffe with the Duke of Lancaster, renders it highly probable that they were personal friends; and if such was the case, it is pleasing to reflect that the gentle piety of the country rector was even more highly appreciated by the poet than the grander qualities of the intrepid

Reformer, and if they met at all, there can be little doubt that their friendship must have been cemented by their thus coming together on the common ground of religious feeling.

There is yet one other point of view in which Chaucer was peculiarly the expression of his time—we mean as an Englishman. During the century which preceded his birth, the English character and language had been steadily evolving themselves from those antagonistic elements which, since the battle of Hastings, had divided men scarcely differing in race—the great original Saxon had now at length absorbed the Norman element, which till then had floated on its surface, and the English nationality and English tongue had assumed the character of complete and finished existences. But we should greatly deceive ourselves if we regarded either the one or the other as entirely the product of the thirteenth century, for though then, and not till then, they assumed that modified and complex form in which we possess them now, they had never at any period of our history ceased from the land, and in so far as the language is concerned, the error of the writers of Tyrwhitt's school, who spoke of it as a new compound substance, formed as it were by pouring the two simple elements of Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman into the same vessel and stirring them together, has been entirely refuted by modern scholars. The English language is now admitted on all hands to have developed itself spontaneously out of the Anglo-Saxon which preceded it; and though we cannot go so far with the reactionary party as to say that it would probably have been in all respects such as we find it if the Norman Conquest had never taken place,* we conceive it to be established beyond the reach of farther controversy, that very few grammatical changes are to be attributed to that event. These we believe to have been the result of that tendency towards simplification which has been pointed out as forming the law of development of all human speech,† and which may be observed in the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian as compared with the old Norse, or in the French, Italian, and Spanish, as compared with the Latin, quite as well as in the English as compared with the Anglo-Saxon. The rule that as languages become modern they substitute prepositions and auxiliary verbs for cases and tenses, is now admitted to be nearly universal, and the flecational changes which the English tongue has undergone, are sufficiently accounted for on this general principle, and would have taken place independently of foreign admixture.

But it is for flecional changes alone that this principle will account, and when we come to the introduction of foreign roots we are driven to seek for causes from without. Now that we have in the English a Roman element, forming, after the Saxon substratum, by far the most important portion of the language, and that we have this element in so much greater degree than the other Gothic languages, German, Danish, Swedish, &c. as to render its introduction from direct contact with the Latin either of the first, or Roman, or of the second, or scholastic period, impossible, we hold to be clear, and it is equally clear that we have the phenomenon exhibiting itself shortly after an historical event which must have brought us in contact with a people who spoke a Romanized language, and such being the case, we confess, for our own part, that we are totally unable to separate the two facts, or to consider the one in any other light than as the cause of the other. The English language unfettered, and very probably (in its structure at all events) unaffected by the Norman, developed itself forth, but it did so in a proximity so close, and in the midst of a contact so continual, as to render it impossible that it should have borrowed nothing from so intimate a fellowship. There was no amalgamation, properly so called, there was not even, except to a very limited extent, (in words, for example, in *tion*,) a direct adoption; the Saxon element asserted its privileges everywhere, and even on what it borrowed from the Norman it immediately stamped its characteristic forms. The manner in which this adaptation took place is well pointed out by Mr. Tyrwhitt, though he has failed to recognise its philological importance. “*Accorder, souffrir, recevoir, descendre*,” he says, “were regularly changed into *accorden, suffren, recevoir, descenden*.” Everywhere we see the impress of the Saxon mint on the Norman ore.

But in proof of the direct influence of the Conquest upon the language to this limited extent, it is also important to remark that subsequent to the age of Chaucer, and what has been called the period of the middle English, when the process of absorption may be considered as completed, we have no further addition of foreign words, except such as can be directly traced to accidental sources. We had no more Conquests, and consequently our language underwent no further change, except that of the natural development of a Gothic tongue. That the original process was one of absorption and not of amalgamation, in the sense in which we have used the terms, is also clearly established by the fact that the further development has been entirely in the Gothic direction, whereas if the two elements of Saxon and Norman had been in anything like equal power, we might have

looked for a development now in the one direction and now in the other.

Such being the view which we take of the formation of the English language, it will not be difficult to characterize the speech which Chaucer employed. In its form it was the Saxon of Edward the Confessor, with such flecional modifications as three centuries of further development had effected; and in its substance it had superadded to the great Saxon substratum, such Norman words as the contact of three centuries had gradually introduced.

Chaucer's language was therefore the language of his time. Of all the errors into which Godwin and his school have fallen, the most absurd is that of asserting that Chaucer at the age of eighteen, when a student at Cambridge, having maturely considered the prospects of his own future celebrity, coolly set himself down to compose his "Court of Love" in English, as the language which was most likely in future to be that of his country, and in order to the proper accomplishment of his task, that he vigorously applied himself to purify and refine that hitherto barbarous tongue. However it may tell for the glory of Chaucer, the truth of the matter unquestionably is, that he took the language as he found it, in its most modern form of course; for he was in this as in other respects of the progressive party of his day, and insensibly he contributed what one mind might do in one generation towards its development. As to his merit in preferring it to the Norman French, all that we have to say is, that though it is highly probable that he knew that language sufficiently to have used it for the purposes of poetical composition if he had chosen, that fact is by no means certain, and that he regarded it at all events in the light of a foreign tongue, is clear on his own showing. "Let then clerkes enditen in Latin, for they have the propertie of science, and the knowing of that facultie; and *lette Frenchmen in their French also enditen their queint termes, for it is kindly to their mouthes, and let us shewe our fantasies in such wordes as we leurneden of our dames tongne.*"

It were needless to occupy the small space which remains to us by insisting further on this point. The theory of that sorrowful interregnum between Anglo-Saxon and English, when our ancestors are said to have spoken a chaotic and Babylonish jargon, incapable of being turned to intellectual uses, is now happily abandoned by all our scholars, and we have the Anglo-Saxon, the semi-Saxon, the old, the middle, and the modern English, each shading gradually and naturally into the other. From the reign of Henry III. up to Chaucer's time, we have a series of political and satirical songs and poems in the vernacular

tongue;* and so far from the native language having been prohibited by the earlier Norman kings, we know that from the Conquest till the reign of Henry II., it was invariably employed by them in their charters, when it made way, not for French, but for Latin.† We have thus at last recovered the missing link, and we have now to thank modern industry for the unbroken chain which binds together our speech and that of our ancestors.

Our space does not permit us to dwell at any length on the poetical merits of Chaucer, and, indeed, our intention from the first has been to supply our readers with such information as might induce them to peruse his works, rather than to save them the trouble of perusal, by furnishing them with opinions ready made. But a few observations before parting, for the purpose of fixing, in some measure, the rank that he is entitled to hold among our poets, we cannot deny ourselves. We do not venture to equal him to the two greatest of them. With Milton, indeed, he can in nowise be compared, for the difference in kind is so absolute as to render it impossible to measure the degree; and by Shakspeare he is unquestionably surpassed in his own walk. The divine instinct of the Swan of Avon he did not possess, and hence his characterization is broad and common as compared with his. But here our admission of inferiority must end. As a poet of character—and as such chiefly he must be viewed, we believe him to come nearer to Shakspeare than any other writer in our language. There is the same vigour in all that he portrays, the same tone of health belongs to it. When Carlyle said that Sir Walter Scott was the healthiest man that ever was, he ought to have added, “after Chaucer.” We believe that no writer ever was so healthy as Chaucer; and we dwell on this characteristic with the greater pleasure that it seems to us a proof of the thoroughly good constitution with which our English life began. Even where he comes in contact with grossness and immorality, they never seem to taint him, or to jaundice his vision. They are ludicrous or hateful, and as such he represents them freely and unshrinkingly; but there is no morbid gloating over impurity, or lingering around vice. There is nothing French about him, neither has he any kindred with such writers

* The first verse of the song against the King of Alemaigne, temp. Henry III., does not differ much from the language of Chaucer.

“Sitteth alle stille ant herkneþ to me:
The Kyn of Alemaigne, bi mi leauté (by my loyalty)
Thritti thousand pound askede he
For to make the pees in the countré.”

Political Songs of England, from the reign of John to that of Edward II., edited for the Camden Society, by Thomas Wright, Esq.

† Codex Diplomaticus.

as those of Charles the Second's time, or with the Swifts, and Sternes, and Byrons of later days. He is not very scrupulous about words, but there is no mistaking his opinion; and the question as to whether his weight is to be thrown into the balance in behalf of virtue or of vice is never doubtful. "If he is a coarse moralist," said Mr. Wordsworth, "he is still a great one."

Chaucer is essentially the poet of man. Brought up from the first among his fellows, and discharging to the last the duties of a citizen, he wandered not,—nor wished to wander in solitary places. His poetry is that of reality, and an Elysium which he sought not in the clouds, he found abundantly in human sympathies. We have spoken of his cheerfulness, and the best description which we can give of him, as he appears in his works, is, that in all respects he is a cheerful, gregarious being, not ashamed to confess himself satisfied with the world in which God has placed him, and with those with whom he has seen fit to people it. There is no affectation of *tridium vite* about him; he does not think himself too good for the world, nor the world too bad for him. Though there is much that he fain would mend, he is still by no means disgusted with matters as they stand, and gladly and thankfully extracts the sweets of a present existence.

The masculine air of his delineations is what strikes us most. His characters are large and strong, and stand out with an almost superfluous fulness of form, which often reminds us of Rubens' pictures; but he is more tender, he has more feeling, and his gentler characters are touched with exquisite delicacy. The "Chapeau de Paille" will bear no comparison with the tender Prioress that "was cleped Madame Eglantine," of whose womanly heart we have the following picture:—

"She was so charitable and so pitous
 She wolde wepe if that she saw a mous
 Caught in a trappe, if it were ded or bledde."

The Prioress's Tale is one of the happiest examples of the pathetic, in which Chaucer was so great a master, and there is a depth and earnestness of feeling about it, and others of the class to which it belongs, which we should scarcely expect in the writings of one usually so gay as Chaucer. There is so much gentle grief which pervades every part of it, that the reader is insensibly led into the feelings of the poor widow who

"Wailleth al that night
 After hire litel childe, and he came nought;,"

and if we compare it with the common version of the story which appears in the Percy Reliques, under the title of the

"Jew's Daughter," we shall see to how great an extent it is indebted for its beauty to Chaucer's genius. If any one should doubt the versatility of Chaucer, and should be tempted to regard him in the light of a mere humorist, let him peruse the Prioress's Tale, and consider her character along with those of Constance, the patient Grisilde, and others of the same class in the serious tales. In these touching delineations, the poet whom we had known, the man of mirth, vanishes from our sight, and in his place we have a character made up of the finest sympathies, and regulated by sincere and humble piety.

Another characteristic of Chaucer as a poet, is his love for external nature. His poems seem everywhere strewn with flowers, and wherever we go we encounter the breezes of spring. The image of "Freshe May" is continually recurring, the very word has a charm for him, and in the Shipman's Tale we find it used as a woman's name. The description of Emilie in the garden, in the commencement of the Knight's Tale, though probably familiar to many of our readers, is so beautiful in itself, and so completely illustrates Chaucer's best style as a poet, that we shall insert it at length, slightly modernizing the spelling. Palamon and Arcite are looking down upon her from the prison.

"Thus passeth year by year, and day by day,
Till it fell once in a morrow of May,
That Emilie, that fairer was to seen,
Than is the lilly upon his stalké green,
And fresher than the May with flowerés new,
(For with the rosé colour strove her hew,
I n'ote which was the finer of them two.)
Ere it was day, as she was wont to do,
She was arisen, and all ready dight,
For May will have no sluggardy a-night.
The season pricketh every gentle heart,
And maketh him out of his sleep to start,
And sayth, 'Arise and do thine observance.'

This maketh Emilie have rémembrance
To do honour to May, and for to riso
Yclothéd was she freshe for to devise.
Her yellow hair was braided in a tress
Behind her back, a yardé long I guess.
And in the garden at the sun uprist,
She walketh up and down where as her list.
She gathereth flowers, partly white and red,
To make a subtle garland for her head;
And as an angel heavenly she sung."

In many respects it seems to us that Chaucer resembles Goethe more than any of the poets of our own country. He has the same mental completeness and consequent versatility which dis-

tinguish the German ; the same love of reality ; the same clearness and cheerfulness ; and, in seeming contradiction to this latter characteristic, the same preference for grief over the other passions, in his poetical delineations. In minor respects, he also resembles him ; and in one, not unimportant, as marking a similarity of mental organization, that, namely, of betaking himself at the close of a long life spent in literature and affairs, to the study of the physical sciences, as if here alone the mental craving for the positive could find satisfaction. We would willingly follow the comparison farther, but we must at length reluctantly bid adieu to what has indeed been to us a labour of love ; and we do so in the hope that we may not be the only gainers from our communings with the poet ; that, notwithstanding the imperfections of our work, the double blessing of charity may be extended to it, in consideration of the object with which it was undertaken, and that it may be the means of introducing some of our readers to the more intimate fellowship of him whom Dr. Johnson refused to recognise as a poet ; but in the “ footing of whose feet ” Edmund Spenser was not ashamed to tread as an humble disciple.

- ART. III.—1. *The History of Rome from the First Punic War to the Death of Constantine*. By B. G. NIEBUHR. In a Series of Lectures, including an Introductory Course on the Sources and Study of Roman History. Edited by LEONHARD SCHMITZ, Ph. D. 2 vols. 8vo. London, 1844.
2. *Vorträge über Römische Geschichte, an der Universität zu Bonn gehalten*. Von B. G. NIEBUHR. 3 vols. 8vo. Berlin, 1846.
3. *Lectures on the History of Rome, from the earliest Times to the Commencement of the First Punic War*. By B. G. NIEBUHR. Edited by Dr. M. ISLER. Translated, with many additions, from MSS., by Dr. LEONHARD SCHMITZ, F.R.S.E., Rector of the High School of Edinburgh. 8vo. London, 1848.
4. *B. G. Niebuhr's Lectures on Roman History, delivered at the University of Bonn*. From the Edition of Dr. M. ISLER. Translated by HAVILLAND LE M. CHEPMELL, M.A., and FRANZ C. F. DEMMLER, Ph. D. Vol. I., 8vo. London, Edinburgh, and Dublin, 1849.

BARTHOLD GEORGE NIEBUHR has an undoubted claim to be considered the founder of a new dynasty of Roman historians. How was he peculiarly qualified to attain this high distinction? And has he any title to be considered the founder of a truthful dynasty?

We shall confine ourselves in this Article to an answer to the first question, and this will require us to glance, very hastily and rapidly, at the leading events of his life, till he became publicly known as an historian.

His noble-hearted and simple-minded father, Carsten Niebuhr, by birth a German, had by his integrity, and the energy of an indomitable will, risen in the service of Denmark from the education of a peasant to be numbered among the most famous of Eastern travellers. In the year 1778, with his wife, who also was of German extraction, an only daughter, then four years old, and Barthold his only son, then in his third year, Carsten Niebuhr left Copenhagen, where he had held nominal rank as an officer of engineers, for Meldorf, in the South Ditmarschen, where he was appointed district secretary. His native place was in Friesland, from which Meldorf was not far distant, and with which he was now enabled to hold more frequent intercourse. For sixteen years the young Niebuhr continued an almost uninterrupted residence in Meldorf. This is the principal town of a dreary, treeless, flat district, abounding in

marshes, which had an injurious effect both on his own constitution and that of his mother. Indeed, his German biographer* remarks, that this was not the only circumstance in which he resembled her. He was like her in personal appearance, save that he wanted her brown eyes—like her, he was passionate, impetuous, but withal affectionate and tender-hearted. If we add a deficiency in physical courage to his father's incorruptible honesty in all matters, literary or otherwise, and also to his father's obstinacy or dogmatism, we get a tolerably correct outline of his moral conformation. For many of his peculiarities we can easily account. Alone with an only sister—himself an only son—having little intercourse with boys of his own age—in a lonely country town—in feeble health—the cherished companion of a sickly mother, he could only have been saved from feebleness of character by his father's practical sense, and an intellect of uncommon vigour and promise, even in his earliest days. His home education—and that was all he had for many years—was such as might have been expected from the habits of his father. That father had made himself, and he held it as a maxim that it was a preposterous absurdity to teach unwilling pupils. In the teaching of languages he did not aim at grammatical indoctrination. He cared more that his son should take an interest in events than in the language in which they were narrated. The following circumstances, besides, contributed to develop in the boy the rare powers of imagination which his after-life unfolded. The traveller was wont to take upon his knee his little boy, and narrate wonderful but true tales of the far

* The sources of Niebuhr's biography used in this brief notice are, 1. The work quoted above, (*Lebensnachrichten über Barthold Georg Niebuhr*,) being a History of his Life, in three volumes, containing a narrative interspersed at epochs with his letters. The materials were furnished principally by his intimate friends, Hensler, Brandis, Bauer, and the publisher Perthes. It was edited, we believe, by Madame Hensler, the daughter-in-law of his old friend Dr. Hensler of Kiel, sister of his first, and aunt of his second wife. It was published at Hamburg, in 1838. A translation of it, by George Valentine Fox, M.A., New College, Oxford, was announced in Tait's Magazine, November 1844, and specimens—which were tolerably accurate representations of the original—given in that and several subsequent numbers. What has become of this work? The whole of the original is deeply interesting, and to the British student would be highly instructive. 2. *Reminiscences of an Intercourse with George Barthold Niebuhr, the Historian of Rome*. By Francis Lieber. London, 1835. Lieber was a German, who having fought in the wars of Grecian independence, in 1821, 1822, was obliged to return home, which he did by way of Italy. He reached Rome with difficulty, penniless, and in no becoming attire. Personally unknown to Niebuhr, who was then Prussian ambassador at Rome, he sought, and gained his protection and assistance. He obtained more. He was taken for a short time into Niebuhr's family as tutor, and these *Reminiscences* are mainly a record of certain opinions and *dicta* of Niebuhr, uttered while Lieber lived with him. There is, besides, an outline of his career principally as a statesman, in a serial publication, entitled *Preussens Staatsmänner*. Leipsic, 1842. His life is the fourth in the series.

lands of the east—of sultans, and caliphs, and the wild Arabs, to whom his heart clung in fond remembrance. Then, in his sixth year, Boie, brother-in-law of the poet Voss, himself a distinguished literary man, and as editor of the German Museum in communication with the *literati* both of the Continent and of England, and moreover possessed of a rich library, became domiciled at Meldorf, as provincial governor, and was soon on the most intimate terms with the traveller and his family. Through him and his library, young Niebuhr came into contact with the general world of literature.

The boy's aptitude for the acquirement of languages was marvellous. It was a matter of course that he spoke both Danish and German. His father had early conceived a strong desire to see him following in his footsteps as a traveller,—and that under the auspices of our own East India Company. Hence he taught his son English with much assiduity. French too was not neglected, nor Arabic; but he failed in the latter, probably as his son himself hints,* from his having lost that ready use of the vocables, essential to a man who disdained grammatical instruction. This language Niebuhr afterwards acquired at Copenhagen. At the age of six he commenced the study of Greek; at eight he mastered with ease any ordinary English book, and was in the habit of reading aloud to his father the English newspapers.† In his French studies, he was materially assisted by Boie's first wife, whose death in 1786, was his first grief. When it was thought proper for him to commence a more methodical course of study, the services of one of the teachers in the grammar school of the place were employed. But the teacher's attainments were a source not of profit but of amusement to his pupil, who tormented him beyond measure, by feigning ignorance, and betraying him into ludicrous blunders. So Niebuhr was again, for a time, left to his own efforts and the aid of his father.

He was roused to inquire into passing events by the Turkish war of 1788, which haunted his night and day dreams, and still more by the troubles in the Netherlands, that broke out under the Emperor Joseph. By this time Meldorf had acquired a certain degree of celebrity, and strangers came to visit the residence of the travelled Niebuhr, and the learned Boie, on whom the fame of his brother-in-law conferred additional distinction. Such visitors were struck with amazement when they found in a meagre boy of thirteen, not only a ready command of many languages, but a most copious fund of geographical, statistical,

* In a life of his father, from which Mrs. Austin drew her materials for the *Traveller's Biography*, published by the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge.—See p. 23 of the latter work.

† *Arnold's Life and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 390.

and historical details. Notwithstanding all this, he was preserved both in his youth and in his riper years from vanity and pride, by his contempt of the superficial, his constant yearning after the real, the simple truthfulness of his nature, and his familiarity with the great intellects, both of his own and of ancient times. There is nothing like this for humbling the conceit which is wont to be engendered by a shallow scholarship.

But the boy must go to school; and so, at Easter 1789, when twelve and a-half years of age, he is found prepared to enter the highest department (*prima*, the Germans call it) of the grammar school, taught by Jäger, the rector, a scholar of considerable eminence. His school education here lasted only till August 1790, when Jäger thinking it absurd to keep back a boy of Niebuhr's talents and attainments, recommended that he should leave school, and under his private instructions—a rare privilege—prepare for the University. At this very time we have a symbol of a great portion of his after career, the union of active business with indefatigable study. His father writes to a friend, when referring to his functions as collector of the district duties,—“Barthold has, in truth, been of valuable assistance to me in my duties as Collector.”

For four years Niebuhr's range of study must have been desultory enough. He was only one hour a day with Jäger, and the work which he had to do for him can have occupied only a small portion of his time. He complains bitterly of this in after years; but, in his case, as in that of many others who have made similar complaints, it may be doubted whether his wide range of reading, which would have been incompatible with a regular range of study, was not after all the best preparation for his after career—to say nothing of the restraints on severe and regular mental exercise, imposed by his feeble constitution in youth.

Various events broke in upon the monotony of his life from this period till he entered the University of Kiel, in 1794. About thirty-five years before, his father, then in pursuit of knowledge under difficulties, had commenced the study of mathematics at Hamburgh, under Büsch. This professor, in addition to his academical labours, now conducted in his own house a Commercial Academy, where the youths were trained in the modern languages, and in the departments of knowledge more directly bearing on mercantile and commercial pursuits. Niebuhr the elder had continued on terms of intimate friendship with Büsch, and was anxious, for many reasons, to place his son under his care. But the experiment did not succeed. The youthful scholar was unfitted by disposition, habit, and inclination for the rattling, gay life, and the rude, noisy jocularities of

his *confrères*, and so after a three months' trial, he returned home, at the harvest of 1792. Another, and more stirring event, which had great influence on his future destinies, as well as the current of his thoughts, was the breaking out of the French Revolution. Whether it was from a precocious profundity of judgment, or derived from his father's contempt and hatred of the French, it is certain that the boy, so far from sharing in the enthusiasm with which so many of his seniors regarded the first glorious days of French freedom, foresaw and predicted the sea of blood in which that bright sun was to set. So alarmed was he by the progress of events, that a favourite project of his was to seek refuge from European troubles in America. It is interesting to notice how, in later years, his historical habits led him to look with distrust on a nation governed by merchants, and unadorned by associations with the mighty past.* So strong in him became the historic feeling.

His father's views for him were bent on some career different from that of a literary life, but unsettled otherwise. All thoughts of travel as a permanent pursuit were ultimately abandoned, from his own want of the necessary bodily vigour, and from his mother's infirm health. Diplomacy seemed a suitable occupation for him. And in the meantime, the father's fame and the son's promise were attracting notice elsewhere. Manuscripts, for collation, were sent to the young Niebuhr, from Copenhagen and Göttingen. Heyne was anxious to superintend his studies, but first it was resolved that he should spend two years in the Danish University of Kiel.

Here (1794-1796) he studied with his wonted enthusiasm, and felt none of the home-sickness which had driven him from Hamburg. His course of study was, at first, the History of the Empire. Introduction to the Study of Civil Law, with Logic and Metaphysics, under Professors of great celebrity—Hegewisch, Cramer, and Reinhold. In his next course, he discontinued his attendance on Cramer, and studied, in addition to the remaining branches, Physics and Organic Chemistry under Einnbke. His aim was to combine mental Philosophy with Physics, Mathematics, and Astronomy, not only for themselves, but as a means to his "darling pursuits, Ancient Literature and History." Here he contracted friendships with many men of eminence in their day, and became favourably known to individuals who were able to promote his interests. Through them, he attracted the notice of Count Schimmelmann, the Danish minister of Finance, whose private

* Compare *Lebensnachrichten*, vol. i. p. 31, with a most interesting letter in *Lieber*, p. 36, &c.

secretary he became in March 1796. The bustle and gaiety of a minister's residence did not suit the habits of the studious Niebuhr; he retired from this appointment in the course of the next year, and was nominated a supernumerary Secretary of the Royal Library of Copenhagen. On a visit to his maternal home, and also on his return, he did not neglect Kiel; and then and there he was betrothed to his first wife Amalie Behrens, who was for years his constant, cherished, and invaluable companion.

But first, that is in the commencement of 1797, he must return to his duties at Copenhagen. And there his dream is to obtain an appointment in the University of Kiel, in order to be near his beloved home, and in the centre of his newly acquired friends, with his own Amalie. Hence he devoted himself with ardour to his philological studies, but always combined with history, waiting till an appointment should open up to him.

Meanwhile it was deemed advisable that he should travel. And as Great Britain alone was, at the time, safe for such a purpose, he sailed in the end of June, 1798, for London. Thence, after seeing a few of his father's old friends, acquired in his eastern travels, he betook himself to the University of Edinburgh, where he spent almost a year, varied, in the summer of 1799, by a few excursions to East-Lothian, Fife, Kinross, and Inverness-shire. It is curious to look back on his letters from Edinburgh, (*Lebensnachrichten*, vol. i. pp. 201-260)—his notions of the literary condition and manners of the people, his opinions of his Professors—Hope, Robison, Playfair, Rutherford, Coventry. No one—save, perhaps, Mr. Laing, the bookseller, and Professors Playfair and Coventry—was aware that there was a young lion in the midst of us. Thus, there is narrated in his letters an amusing incident which occurs in the course of a visit paid to East-Lothian. One of the lairds, little knowing that he had under his roof the future illustrator of Roman history, and, what is more to the purpose, as his lairdship might not have cared for that, a future minister of finance and ambassador, coolly walked him out of the house, as he expected that day a large dinner party. On Niebuhr's return home by London he worked hard at a revision of what he had learned of the sciences in Edinburgh, and it was not till April, 1800, that he repaired to Copenhagen, where he obtained from Government two inconsiderable appointments, connected with the Danish commercial interest. Immediately thereafter he married his beloved Amalie, and was offered a professorship in Kiel, which, for various reasons, he refused.

Then, in 1801, came Nelson's bombardment of Copenhagen, of which Niebuhr, in his letters, gives a lively account. (*Lebensnachrichten*, vol. i. pp. 286-301.)

He continued in the service of Denmark till 1806, his labours,

chiefly connected with finance, ever increasing. Yet he never let go his hold of antiquity. Thus, we find him, in a letter, of December 1803, writing in the following terms :—

“ I am working at a Dissertation, as I before briefly wrote you. The subject is the nature of the Roman public lands, their apportionment, colonies, the Agrarian Law, &c. This is an interesting subject, and I believe that I have made it more distinct than has hitherto been done. With studies like these I occupy myself, as if I were still at Kiel.”—*Lebensnachrichten*, vol. i. p. 278.

The sympathy of his wife was a great cordial and support to him in his multifarious labours, as bank-director and trade-commissioner. With her, at his leisure hours, he read everything new of interest. To her he communicated all his plans. She even carried on the study of Greek, that she might the more fully share in his pursuits, till her feeble health forced her to abandon it. Not long before her death, in 1815, when he was passionately asking her if he could do anything for her, she replied, “ Yes ; finish your History whether I live or die.”—*Lebensnachrichten*, vol. ii. p. 114.

Towards the close of 1805, tempting offers were made to him on the part of the Prussian Government, which, after great hesitation, he accepted, and that with the reluctant assent of his steady friend, Count Schimmelmann. Accordingly, in October 1806, when thirty years of age, he became for evermore a German. But he came to the court of Berlin only to share its flight, after the battles of Jena and Auerstadt. Stettin, Dantzic, Königsberg, were the first hasty stages. He made a longer stay at Memel, where he cultivated Slavonic lore, in his own thorough fashion. In April 1807, we find Niebuhr employed in finance and the commissariat, under the administration of Count Hardenberg. Important events followed each other quickly—the battle of Friedland—the rapid approach of the French, and the peace of Tilsit. Worn out and distracted by his wife's illness, which rendered these constant journeys both annoying and dangerous, Niebuhr had tendered his resignation to Count Hardenberg. But the minister, with tears in his eyes, besought him not to abandon the king at such a crisis, and he then reluctantly consented to remain in office. He again endeavoured to withdraw when Hardenberg was dismissed, in terms of the treaty of Tilsit, but yielded to the king's earnest entreaties. In consequence he returned to Memel, where he learned of the second assault of the English on Copenhagen, (1807,) and the seizure of the Danish fleet.

Till 1810, he laboured most laboriously in the service of the Prussian Government, negotiating loans, acting as a privy coun-

cillor, a commissioner of the treasury, and undertaking financial duties, which must have overwhelmed him, had it not been for his elasticity under labour. But when, in 1809, he found plans meditated, which had the sanction of the king and the authority of Count Hardenberg, (again the real, though not the ostensible prime minister,) but which appeared to Niebuhr impracticable, dangerous, and oppressive, he requested permission to retire. At the same time he applied for a professorship in the University of Berlin, which was on the eve of being opened for the first time. Many efforts were made to retain his services. His name was placed on the list of the treasury commissioners, and publicly announced, and Count Hardenberg came in person to present him, in the king's name, with the third class order of the Red Eagle. But he had before this received an honour which he valued more highly—he had been elected a member of the Berlin Academy of Science, (*Akademie der Wissenschaften*), and proof against all solicitations, he retired with the admiring regret of the king and his minister, receiving, at the same time, the appointment of Historiographer, in place of Müller, the celebrated historian of Switzerland.

His exultation on returning to uninterrupted study, after an interval of fourteen years, was unbounded. We find him on the 15th of July, busily preparing for the Academy—that they might find him no unworthy brother—a dissertation on the Amphictyonic Council.* His position gave him a right to lecture in any of the Universities of Prussia. Of this right, in co-operation with other members of the Academy, and at the earnest solicitation of the learned Spalding and Nicolovius, he availed himself. In the beginning of November, 1810, he for the first time promulgated those views of Roman History which he afterwards unfolded, with some modifications, in his published works. The first volume of his History appeared in 1811.

Thus it was that Niebuhr commenced that course of which it has been well said, that “it may be safely affirmed that no man can be regarded as competent to discuss or investigate the early history of any nation, or to appreciate any question of literary criticism, who has not first acquired the habits which Niebuhr's History illustrates, and is so admirably adapted to form.”

It is now time to take up the question, how far Niebuhr's genius, acquirements, and moral condition, fitted him to be the trustworthy founder of a new school of historians?

For this important service his early training, his natural gifts, and the course of his maturer life, pre-eminently qualified him.

* This, which is interesting as his first published production, will be found in vol. II. of his *Kleine hist. und philol. Schriften*, p. 158.

His father's attachment to his native Friesland was strong. Together they often made journeys thither; and with German simplicity, they kept up their connexion with their peasant relations. Now the nature of the rights possessed by the freeholders of Friesland was well suited to attract the attention of a thoughtful youth, one of whose favourite dreams was to colonize new lands, and to give new constitutions. The hereditary owners of the soil, the freeholders, constituted originally the legislative body, and had no superiors, in the feudal sense, but the State. In this we have the germ of Niebuhr's subsequent notions regarding the Patricians—the Burghers, the hereditary landholders of Rome—who held of the State the *Ager Publicus*. Again, as to the Ditmarsians, among whom his youth was spent, he was not loath to acknowledge his great obligations to his intimacy with their habits. Thus we find him saying:—

“It is a very great mistake to consider the Romans as exclusively a warlike people. They were essentially farmers; they loved farming, and their greatest men paid much attention to it. This circumstance must always be remembered in studying Roman History; it alone explains a variety of phenomena in their political development. My knowledge of country life and farming, as well as my acquaintance with the Ditmarsians, have greatly assisted me in my historical inquiries. Those Ditmarsians were a very peculiar race—as gallant lovers of liberty as ever existed.”—*Lieber*, p. 107.

Then the habits of his quiet domestic life, without impairing the sense of the humorous, in which he always found great enjoyment—good caricatures exciting in him side-splitting laughter, (*Lebensnachrichten*, vol. i. p. 346,)—saved him from plunging into the frivolities, or the more debasing pursuits of fashion and of pleasure. And, in this respect, even in his early career, especially in the house of Count Schimmelmann, his temptations were great. Niebuhr's home was ever associated with his books. His relaxation was study, and learning was his amusement when it was not his professed occupation.

His memory was extraordinary. On one occasion Lieber (p. 94) expressed his astonishment when he found that Niebuhr was as well acquainted with the bye-ways, remains of wells, paths over high ridges, and other minute details in the topography of Greece, as if he had been there. “Oh,” said Niebuhr, “I never forget anything I once have seen, heard, or read.” His biographer confirms this—

“His memory was so extraordinary, that he almost never forgot anything that he had read or heard; and it united a readiness in the most minute references, with the faculty of weighing and combin-

ing analogies apparently remote. In order to put the extent of his memory to the proof, when he was in Copenhagen, his first wife and her sister amused themselves with taking up Gibbon, and questioning him, from the index, on the most unimportant particulars. They continued this for a considerable time till they were tired of it, and gave up the hope of finding a single instance of error, or, in a single instance of convicting him of failing in a knowledge of the complete connexion between the subjects on which he was questioned. And all this examination was carried on while he was engaged in another employment—some light piece of writing.”—*Lebensnachrichte.*, vol. i. p. 346.

His knowledge of languages was most extensive. The elder Niebuhr in a letter to a friend, (*Lebensnachrichten*, vol. i. p. 30,) mentions that his son, who was then at Memel, had learned seventeen European languages, besides Hebrew, Persian, and Arabic. This is confirmed by Niebuhr's own statement. Lieber thus writes of him, while at Rome, in 1822 :—

“I (Lieber) had found a Russian grammar and some Russian books in his library, and asked him, if he had ever studied that language? He said, ‘Oh yes, I would not leave the whole Slavonic stock of languages untouched; and I wished to understand all the *European* languages at least. Every one may learn them; it is easy enough after we once know three. I now understand all the languages of Europe pretty well, not excepting my own German, only those Slavonic idioms excepted. I have not read much in them; only I know them.’ . . . Do you speak most of the languages you know? I asked, ‘Yes, nearly all,’ he replied, ‘except the Slavonic idioms, as I told you.’”—*Lieber*, p. 76.

His was not mere amateur scholarship. This superficialism to which he was much exposed by the liberty of study in which he roamed in his early years, was prevented by his retentive memory, his intercourse with great scholars, his habit of investigating the depths of every subject before him, his innate love of the real, and his laborious habits. He never ceased to be a scholar, even when he was busiest as a statesman. That he is entitled to the very highest rank as a Philologist, is abundantly proved by his writings in the *Rheinisch Museum*, a publication which, with the aid of Professor Brandis, he conducted at Bonn, after his return from Rome, in 1823. To many of them the English reader has access, in translations which appeared in the *Classical Journal* and the *Philological Museum*. Of course his scholarship was both deepened and extended as he advanced in years. But the highest expectations must have been early formed of him, when the collation of manuscripts was intrusted to him at the early age of seventeen. And what use he made of his habits, thus acquired, may be known from the fact, that

to him we are indebted for the discovery (at Verona, when he was on his road, as Prussian Ambassador, to Rome, in 1816) of the remains of the Roman Jurist, Caius, and at Rome of less important portions of the writings of Cicero and of Livy. Above all—his most material service to scholarship, apart from his Histories—he not only edited the first volume of the new edition of the Byzantine Historians, but it was at his suggestion that this stupendous work was undertaken by the Berlin Academy. It is a rare distinction, that on the title-page of each volume of such a work such a body of *literati* should have pride in inscribing, as its best recommendation and introduction,

CONSILIO B. G. NIEBUHR, C.F.

But he was not a mere philologer, he revelled in the spirit as well as the form of languages, and brought their essence to bear on his theme. Thus, he was deeply imbued with a love of Shakspeare. His friend Boie tells an interesting incident of his reading to the parents of Niebuhr Shakspeare's play of Macbeth, without thinking of the boy who was present, then not seven years of age, till he observed what an effect it had upon him. Boie then took the trouble of explaining the drama to him, and seemingly with some difficulty convinced him that the witches were only the creatures of the poet's fancy. To his great astonishment, the father produced to him some time afterwards an accurate account of all the essential circumstances of the play, written by the child on seven sheets of paper. Niebuhr wept when his father asked to see what he was doing, through fear that he had not done it right. See how the impression abides with him till the close of life. Forty-five years afterwards he commences a lecture thus:—

“Shakspeare has connected awful phenomena of nature with the occurrences in the moral world, as Thucydides connects the physical phenomena of the Peloponnesian War with the moral condition of the people. During the second Punic War the earth was shaken by extraordinary convulsions and fermentations which were going on in its bowels; and Pliny says, that in one year fifty-seven earthquakes were reported at Rome—a greater number than has ever been observed before in so short a period.”—*Schmitz's Edition of Lectures*, vol. i. p. 185.

The range of his education enabled him to combine and compare matters bearing intimately on the physical facts of history; and, in estimating the truth of many statements made by the early historians, it is desirable, indeed it is sometimes necessary, to know something of the sciences that are founded upon observation. We have not space for the lengthened illustrations

which this subject would require. We would merely remind the readers of Niebuhr of his remarks on the Cyclopiæ cities, the draining of the *Vallis Albana*, and other similar passages.

It adds no small weight to the proofs of his qualifications, that he seems early to have cherished the idea of history—and that Roman history—as his proper vocation. Thus he writes home from Kiel, on the 2d August 1794, (when discussing his philosophical studies) :—

“ But my vocation is history ; and philosophy, when once acquired, I will perhaps make to act as her handmaiden.”—*Lebensnachrichten*, vol. i. p. 51.

To these philosophical studies he had devoted himself with much assiduity at the bidding of Dr. Hensler, whom, at his first introduction, he had startled with the germ of those ideas which afterwards found a place in his history. Thus he writes home from Kiel on the 11th May 1794 :—

“ My ideas on the origin of the Greek races, the history of the extension of the Greek cities, and especially my ideas on the oldest movement made by the nations from west to east, are new to him, and probable. He advised me to bring them into as distinct a form as possible. But he will, at first, permit me to engage almost in no other study than philosophy ; the other I must give up, or at least devote but little time to it.”—*Ibid.*, p. 40.

Niebuhr repeatedly returns to the same subject in his letters from Kiel. To have the qualifications of a statesman, according to the notions of Bolingbroke, is one of his aims—and this to please his father, who, at first, could not bear the notion of his betaking himself to a literary life. But there is a strong undercurrent of historical lore running through all his thoughts and pursuits. It has often been remarked, and it deserves notice here, that to a cherished profession, or to a favourite pursuit, all our associations are directed, whatever may be our present employment. As the geologist sees in rocks principally lessons or illustrations of a former world, and the agriculturist looks on them mainly as the enemy of the plough and the waving crop, and the lover of the picturesque views them as the crowning glories of the wild and the sublime, or as Brindley looked on rivers only as feeders for canals—so does each man, whose mind is intent on one object, assimilate, to use a physiological term, all his mental nourishment, so as to become part and parcel of his leading idea and pursuit. Hence Niebuhr, in Meldorf, Kiel, England, Copenhagen, Berlin, wherever he was, however engaged, in study or in flight, or in active financial labour, assimilated all to history :—not, perhaps, at first distinctly ; for we find this in Lieber (p. 65) :—

"My early residence in England gave me one important key to Roman history. It is necessary to know civil life by personal observation, in order to understand such states as those of antiquity. I never could have understood a number of things in the history of Rome without having observed England.—Not that the idea of writing the history of Rome was then clear within me; but when, at a later period, this idea became more and more distinct in my mind, all the observation and experience I had gained in England came to my aid, and the resolution was taken."

Like all great students he meditated more than he performed. As he trusted much to his stupendous memory he seldom finished any outline on paper. He conceived first, and then, with the whole subject in his head, embodied the results in writing. But there were found in his writings notes of what he intended to do—in very various departments—in politics, statistics, finance, history, and jurisprudence. It is interesting to notice in some of them the germs of his after-productions. Thus there was found, after his death, among his papers a note, which his biographer refers to the year 1802 or 1803, while he was in Copenhagen:—

"Works which I have to complete:—1. The Dissertation on the Roman Demesne Lands. 2. A Translation of Extracts (*auszügliche Uebersetzung*) from El Wakidi. 3. History of Macedonia. 4. Exhibition of the Roman Constitution in its different epochs. 5. History of the Decline of the Achæan League, of the Social War, of the Civil War of Marius and Sylla. 6. Of the Constitution of the Greek States. 7. Of the Reign of the Caliphs."—*Lebensnachrichten*, vol. i. p. 318.

Though he joyfully agreed to lecture at the opening of the university of Berlin, it was not till the September of that year that he had fixed upon his subject, and the course was to commence on the 1st of November. When he did begin, he threw himself on his subject 'tith his whole soul, with the impetuous delight of a mind like his when it has at last found freedom to pour out the collected store of years, gathered from all sources of learning, and from the acutest observations of living, real men.

The political life of Niebuhr, the experience which he had had of finance, of troublous times, of arms and of revolutions, the references which he was called upon to make to the various interests of his country, and of its connexions with other nations, his varied experience in delicate negotiations, combined with an incredible quickness of judgment, keen powers of observation, and great comprehensiveness of grasp, caused the past, when once fabricated and pieced together by him from fragments, to other eyes disjointed and valueless, to start up, like a living thing, full of lincament, distinct, real. Hear himself on this qualification:—

"The great misfortune has been that, with one or two exceptions, those who have written on Roman history either had not the stuff for it, or they were no statesmen. Yet no one can write a history of this people without being a statesman, and a practical one too. * * * No wonder that so little has been done in Roman history; for a Roman historian ought to be a sound and well read philosopher and a practical statesman." I [Lieber] asked whether some periods of Roman history did not require also military knowledge? M. Niebuhr answered:—"Roman history can be understood by a statesman who is not a general, but not by a general who is no statesman; for it is the growth of the law which constitutes the essential part of Roman history. Military knowledge, in a considerable degree, is always necessary, I admit; but then this may be obtained without one's being necessarily a soldier."—*Lieber*, p. 67.

No less an authority than Dr. Arnold thus writes of the political knowledge of Niebuhr:—

"In all such questions he is to me the greatest of all authorities, because, together with an ability equal to the highest, he had a universal knowledge of political history, far more profound than was ever possessed by any other man."—*Arnold's Life and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 192.

Niebuhr's political notions were of a mixed nature. He had a strong bias to freedom, but not to a freedom of *forms*. His love of the real, his experience of the horrors of the French Revolution, his observation of the manly inhabitants of the Ditmarschen, his admiration of England, all combined to make him recognise in the old Roman struggle for plebeian independence, where men of law-honouring, upright minds, strove strenuously, constitutionally, and triumphantly, for self-government, and the evolving of rights already possessed, the model of all attempts at rational and genuine freedom.* Thus he says:—

* He was for some time political or finance tutor to the then Crown Prince, now the King of Prussia. How far may the sentiments of the mob-hating, rational-freedom-loving, form-despising Niebuhr have acted upon his pupil? It may be interesting at this time to select a few from many passages in Niebuhr's letters regarding—the future Emperor of Germany. The extract is from a letter to his friend Madame Hensler, dated Berlin, 17th December, 1814:—"I have several times before this intended to sit down for the purpose of telling you the pleasure afforded me by the hours spent with the Crown Prince, but I have been hindered by interruptions or by work. I am glad when the day comes on which to go to him. He is attentive, inquisitive, full of interest—and all the princely gifts, with which nature has so richly endowed him, unfold themselves in these hours before me. Our work often takes a turn to conversation, but never to gossip, and there is no loss in consequence. His playful manner presents no hindrance to deep interest, and his heart is stirred as profoundly as his imagination flies with light wing. He seeks conviction and correction without in any way surrendering to mere authority. I have never seen a finer nature in a young man."—*Lebensnachrichten*, vol. ii. p. 127.

"In most of the late attempts at establishing free institutions nations have committed the great mistake of seeking liberty in the legislative branch only, or mainly; but liberty depends at least as much upon the administrative branch as upon any other. The English are the only modern European nation who have acted differently; and the freedom of North America rests upon this great gift from Old England even more than on the representative form of her government, or on any thing else."—*Lieber*, p. 63.

This is the key to Niebuhr's opinions on ancient and modern governments—his contempt of mere forms of freedom, and his approval of self-control and self-development in the various parts of a constitution. Indeed, his views in this respect made him take up an isolated position from both court and reformers. He disliked the *bureaucracy* of the former, and he feared the theorizing, rashness, and unreal visions of the other.

The last point which we have room to notice is the independence of thought generated by his home education and solitary musings—be it remembered that the only classical training which he had in a disciplined, orderly way, was for about a year and a half at Meldorf—combined with the check upon this exercise by his intimacy and correspondence with learned men of all countries; as in earlier days, with Voss and Klopstock; thereafter with Jacobi, Schlosser, Stolberg, Valkenaer; then in a literary club at Berlin, with Spalding, Buttmann, Heindorf, Schleiermacher, not to mention Böckh, Savigny, and the whole host of the *literatissimi* of Germany, irresistibly attracted by the new views of the ex-financier and statesman, who had negotiated treaties of great national importance, and yet was most ambitious to be known as a simple man of letters—whose cherished patent of nobility was the recognition of his claim as the upbuilder of historic truth.*

As we are anxious to glance at the works whose names are prefixed to this Article, we have no space to dwell on the claims of Niebuhr to occupy the rank of the restorer of the truth of

* "I [Niebuhr] have been asked whether I wish for a title of nobility? I never could bring myself to accept of such an offer. I should feel as if I were insulting the memory of my father, whom I am far from resembling."—*Lieber*, p. 135. His father had refused a title of nobility from the Danish Government. When asked by a relation if he had caused himself to be ennobled—"No," replied he; "I would not offer my family such an affront."—P. 32 of Mrs. Austin's *Life of Carsten Niebuhr*. Compare with this the following passage in the Historian's Preface to his first volume;—"The further continuation down to the term I have now set before me, I may, if it please God, and his blessing abide with me, confidently promise, although the progress may be but slow. It is the work of my life; which is to preserve me a name not unworthy of my father's. I will not lazily abandon it."—*English Translation*, p. xii. He accepted, however, the third class order of the Red Eagle and the first class of the Austrian Knighthood of Leopold—both being bestowed on him for his services at Rome.

Roman history, either in its early periods or in its constitutional development. We may return to this subject, and show wherein consists the peculiarity of his views, chiefly with the view of examining how far subsequent research, conducted after his own fashion, has served to confirm or to reverse his decisions. One remark, in the meantime, we may be permitted to make. It is a common rule to judge of a man's skill, in matters which we do not know, from his power or discrimination in those with which we are acquainted. In the early history of Rome, an ordinary reader might be puzzled to decide on Niebuhr's success. But in the third volume of his History he reaches a period where every scholar of tolerable acquirements may judge for himself. And we think that it will be admitted by all competent judges, that it is impossible to read this portion of the History without *feeling* that Niebuhr is depicting real men and real events—unostentatiously grouping and painting marches and battles, as if he had been an eye-witness—and, realizing to our imagination scenery with which he had become personally familiar, as, to be sure, he had. We may quote the opinion of Arnold on this point.

"It is since I saw you that I have been devouring with the most intense admiration the third volume of Niebuhr. The clearness and comprehensiveness of all his military details is a new feature in that wonderful mind, and how inimitably beautiful is that brief account of Terni."—*Life and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 371.

Yet it cannot be denied that, especially in the earlier portion of the History, we have mainly dissertation instead of narrative. While the purely historical portion will always command attention, from his admirable power of weighty unadorned narrative—weighty from the feeling that what is told is not only true, but the matured conviction of a truthful genius—we must confess that we entertain a suspicion that the earlier portions will be reserved for the scholar to study—a quarry from which others, such as Arnold, will dig the materials wherewith to rear less complicated structures.

It is fortunate, in these circumstances, that Niebuhr's Lectures do not labour under this disadvantage. Their literary history is, briefly, as follows:—

When Niebuhr, in 1823, returned from his Roman embassy, he found, after a short visit to Berlin, that a permanent residence there would be, for political reasons, an unpleasant one. He retired to Bonn, where he continued till his death in January 1831, with an interval of some six months, spent at Berlin in 1828, at the desire of the king himself. Being a "Free Associate" of the recently-erected university of Bonn, he com-

menced, in the summer session of 1825, to lecture on Greek history. Thereafter, till his death, with the exception of the time during which he was at Berlin, he discoursed regularly on various subjects, devoting the fees derived from the lectures to the maintenance of poor students, and the institution of university prizes. On Roman history he delivered two memorable courses:—the one, in the winter of 1826–7, embraced a philological inquiry into the sources of Roman history, and carried down the course till the time of Sylla;—the other occupied the winter and summer sessions of 1828–9, and extended over the whole period of Roman history, down to the fall of the Western Empire. Dr. Leonhard Schmitz had been a student of Niebuhr's during the last course. He had an intense admiration of the great historian; and having become a resident in London, he had, in co-operation with Dr. William Smith, the editor of two Dictionaries illustrative of ancient literature, which mark an era in the scholarship of this country, translated the third volume of the history. He was struck with the thought that Niebuhr's views were much more likely to become familiarly known through his Lectures than his History, and he suggested the idea to his family in Germany; but as Niebuhr did not write out his Lectures, their publication could only be effected from notes taken by the students. The friends of Niebuhr were afraid of sacrificing the great master's fame, and refused to stir in the matter. Fortunately for the world, Dr. Schmitz took heart of grace, and collected in Germany, for collation, and to ensure completeness, a number of notes of the last course of lectures. In 1844, England gave the learned world the first view of the German Niebuhr as a lecturer on history. A wretched translation of the work into German alarmed and roused the friends of Niebuhr, and they had recourse to the same plan as that first adopted by Schmitz—the collection of notes. The first volume appeared in 1846; but it is to be distinctly noted, that, with the exception of a portion, the German publication broke ground at a period different from that opened up by Dr. Schmitz. He had justly deemed that the English public would be most interested in those views of Niebuhr which his History had not embraced, and, accordingly, he gave only the Introductory Lectures on the sources of Roman history, and the later period of the history itself, from the First Punic War. Thus England had,—1. Niebuhr's views of the sources of Roman history in the *Lectures*; 2. his *History* extended in three volumes to the First Punic War; 3. his views of the history from the First Punic War to the time of Constantine, were given in the remaining part of the *Lectures*. Matters might have rested here, but the German editor commenced regularly from the beginning; and as many readers might desire to have Niebuhr's views completed in the form of Lectures, Dr. Schmitz

translated that portion of the German work which he had previously left untouched; and, besides, as we have ascertained from examination, he has added many important passages from the fuller manuscripts in his hands. Any one who is acquainted with the method in which students take notes, will understand how much one set may differ from another; and these differences were heightened, in the case of Niebuhr, from the peculiar qualities and characteristics of the man. With his high-pitched—to speak profanely, his *squeaking* voice—his small person,* and also with his enthusiastic, impetuous temperament, and his inexhaustible store of illustration—his perfect command of his subject and his consciousness of power, he poured forth such a torrent of narrative, comment, disquisition, personal anecdote, description, eulogy, vituperation, (for he was too often in extremes, his *dramatis personæ* being devils or angels)—that he quite took the breath from the wondering Teutons. But what one set of notes lacked another supplied, and by full collaboration, a remarkably accurate report was supplied. Our confidence is confirmed by the following circumstance. Dr. Schmitz's publication, and that of Germany, so far as the Introductory Lectures are concerned, were derived from totally different sources. Indeed, in the portion of the Lectures first published in Germany, and re-produced by Dr. Schmitz, it is evident that the book, as we have it, is not a mere translation of the German, but partly derived from it, and partly from another set of notes altogether. And yet the agreement between them, in the main, places the faithfulness of the reporters beyond all question. In this we, in England, have the advantage. Wherever there was matter in the German notes, not to be found in those in this country, the deficiency could be easily supplied, by translating the additional matter. But wherever the German notes are deficient the case is altered. The German edition is bound to give not only *what* Niebuhr said, but *how* he said it; and to translate from English into the Niebuhrian dialect, would both be impossible, and, if possible, too dishonest to be thought of for a moment by his friends.† The three volumes

* A lively Picture of Niebuhr is given by Dr. Arnold.—*Life and Correspondence*, vol. ii. p. 388.

† All Niebuhr's Lectures are, we are glad to learn, in the course of publication. Two volumes of Lectures on Ancient History, and on the history of "The Last Forty Years,"—referring to the French Revolution—have already appeared in Germany. His family have with great good taste, and a proper regard to their father's fame, committed the translation, as a sacred charge, to Dr. Schmitz. This we learn from a notice at the end of the *Vorträge*, &c., vol. i., by the editor, Dr. Isler.

By the way, no notice whatever is taken of Dr. Schmitz's services in the new translation. Is this usual with literary men?

containing the Lectures, thus partly originating with, and partly enlarged by Dr. Schmitz, are in a high degree refreshing, interesting, and impulsive to the highest methods of historical investigation and pursuit. They place the lecturer, with all his powers and peculiarities, vividly before us. The style is clear, unaffected, and uninvolved. From Dr. Schmitz's remarkable command of our language and its idioms, from his scholarship and his intimate acquaintance with the subject, as evinced by his own History of Rome, he has been enabled to confer a signal service on the scholars of this country. He has done more. He it was who gave the Germans themselves the means of stamping perennially on their University history the very form and pressure of one of the largest minds that ever graced their annals.

We were therefore somewhat surprised when we saw a new translation announced. Not only had Dr. Schmitz earned the gratitude of the reading public—not only were his labours completely satisfactory, but it was evident that a new translation must be defective, for any new *doers* were precluded by the law of copyright from availing themselves of Dr. Schmitz's additional matter. And this is often the most interesting of the whole. Most of the students laid down the pen when Niebuhr digressed, as they thought, into literary gossip; the wiser portion perceived its value, and followed him through all his reminiscences. These hints—these *disjecta membra*—are generally the most characteristic portions of the discourses in which they occur. But now that the new translation has actually reached us, we judge it to be doubly fortunate that we had Dr. Schmitz's first, as the chances are that with this alone in our hands we should have pronounced Niebuhr, when uttering *vivâ voce* his historic responses, to be infected with not only the dogmatism, but with the obscurity of the ancient oracles. Or, it might be true of Niebuhr, as of another great man,

“He wrote like an angel, but talk'd like poor Poll.”

We may amuse our readers and ourselves with a few specimens of the new translation.

“His [Beaufort's] literary and personal imperfections caused him to root up the tares with the wheat.”—P. 3.

Original (p. 3): Das Kind mit dem Bade auszuschütten—a highly humorous idiom, literally, “to empty out the child with the bath.” Dr. Schmitz translates it, “to reject the wheat with the chaff.” His followers seem to have thought it enough to use the same words, no matter in what order. How would they relish, Das Bad mit dem Kinde auszuschütten?

"Some verses in it are taken from Claudius Sacerdos, *who is still lying in manuscript in Vienna*" (!)—P. 25.

"Whenever Gaius stands upon his own legs, he has no substantiated historical statements."—P. 35.

"Wherefore at that time *already*," (*schon*).—P. 321.

So *passim* in the use of *schon*, the force of which answering to the Latin *jam tunc*, is best rendered in English by such expressions as—"even as early as this."

"A *fabulist* is *always* an *unlearned* man, and even a *learned* one would have made here some mistake."—P. 327.

What, a learned fabulist, when a fabulist is *always* unlearned ! Our friends must have studied in the land of bulls. Are they accurate interpreters ? Then, Shades of Esop, Phaedrus, Fontaine, Gay, Grimm, "avenge yourselves alone on Niebuhr." Yet, no ; for what Niebuhr (p. 330) really says is, that a *falsifier of history* "is always *deficient in erudition* ; and even a *learned man* would have blundered here."—*Schmitz's Translation*, p. 278.

In short, if our readers wish to enjoy Niebuhr in *broken English*, they have a rich treat in this volume. But we cannot promise them much edification. There are manifest traces of carelessness even in rendering their author in their own way. We shall give one instance.

"Afterwards we once find these military tribunes instead of the consuls, and Dionysius on that occasion says that it was determined to satisfy the plebeians, by appointing military tribunes, three of whom were to be patricians, and three plebeians. *But there were only three, and one of them was a plebeian.*"—*Schmitz's Translation*, *ibid*.

On this last clause, which is in the original, depends wholly a charge of inaccuracy made by Niebuhr against Livy ; but it is omitted in the new translation, and the whole passage is thereby rendered unintelligible.

As the translators evidently do not understand Niebuhr's peculiar views, they consequently cannot reproduce them. Thus, there is a well-known distinction between the *connubium*, the full legal marriage of Roman citizens, and other marriages, which, according to law, did not confer the full legal privileges and consequences of the *connubium*. It was by the *Lex Canuleia* that this *connubium* was permitted between the patricians and the plebeians, though Niebuhr argues that *marriages* between individuals of the two orders must have been quite common before that time. Whenever he speaks of the marriage sanctioned by law, he terms it *connubium* ; other forms he calls by the German name, *Ehe*. Throughout the whole account of the *Lex Canuleia*, the new translators (p. 326) do not give a hint of any such distinction. They speak of "the *repeal* of the *prohibition* of inter-

marriage between patricians and plebeian" as being "a remarkable change"—and state, moreover, that this prohibition was "sanctioned by usage;" and yet immediately below, "mixed marriages from both orders [?] must surely have been common at all times." Poor Niebuhr!

From apparent innocence of anything beyond a mere acquaintance with the elements of Roman literature, these translators make singularly absurd errors, that are ludicrous in those who volunteer to be the interpreters of such a gigantic scholar as Niebuhr.

Thus Niebuhr refers on one occasion (p. 34, *Vorträge*) to the scholiast *zum Ibis* (on the *Ibis*.) The translators are evidently unaware of Ovid's Satire of that name, (*Ibis* or *in Ibin*), and suppose *Ibis* to be the name of an *Author*; hence they say, (p. 35,) "The scholiast on *Ibis*!"

"Vopiscus mentions that they [*the Annales Pontificum*] had been kept *ab excessu Romuli*, beginning therefore with Numa; but this is only the opinion of an illiterate man."—P. 6.

Why, Vopiscus is one of the authors of the *Historiæ Augustæ*, and the passage referred to by Niebuhr (which has *post excessum*, and not *ab excessu**) will be found at the commencement of his life of the Emperor Tacitus. Niebuhr (p. 6) says that he was *ungelehrt*—but this does not import illiterate; all the force of it is "deficient in erudition."

But more than enough of this: We should probably have allowed this curious production to die a natural death, had we not been provoked by a disingenuous mis-statement and insinuation in the prospectus, which we are grieved to see issuing from the house of a respectable publisher. It is this:—

"Our translation is a faithful version of the authorized German edition, having, like the original, for its sole object, to give a correct text, which, *as emanating from Niebuhr himself*, will ever remain a standard work; while *any additions, not originating with him*, would be likely soon to lose their value."

We had another motive: We feared that our ingenuous youth might be deterred by the uncouth horrors of the interpreters from benefiting by discourses possessed of a rare and rich union of qualities—being profound, simple, quaint, original, unaffected, suggestive, and stimulative.

* This is no fault of the Translators, as the German original bears them out,—saving so far as they were bound to trace their authorities, and unostentatiously correct, wherever correction was needed. This passage is one of the few that do not occur in Dr. Schmitz's edition. And this reminds us, that one good fruit may be produced by this translation. We venture to suggest a new edition of the Lectures from Dr. Schmitz, embodying, in a consecutive and complete form, both the notes in the names of the German editor and those in his own.

ART. IV.—*Essay on the Union of Church and State.* By BAPTIST WRIOTHESLEY NOEL, M.A. Pp. 631. London, 1848.

No person of reflecting mind will deny that the astonishing revolutions of the past year must have materially affected all the old relations between Church and State. The whole fabric of society has been shaken to its centre, and whatever may be the final result, it is very obvious that the former connexion between the spiritual and secular kingdoms, if not destined to be dissolved, must, in order to meet the altered exigencies and advancing demands of the age, undergo some important modifications. Great difference of opinion, no doubt, still exists among good men of various parties, on the general question of religious establishments; but while some are swayed by the love, and others deterred by the dread of change,—while one party may be cleaving with pertinacious attachment to ancient institutions, and another may be driven into the attitude of open warfare against them,—there is, we firmly believe, another and a growing party, who, averse to join either with the bigot or the leveller, feel persuaded that the time has come when the union of Church and State, as it now exists, whether at home or abroad, cannot and ought not to stand much longer.

In our own country, we are satisfied, that so far as true Christians of all parties are concerned, the question is gradually narrowing itself within very small compass. From the extremes into which partisans were betrayed in the heat of controversy, they have been approximating each other more nearly than they themselves may imagine. On the one hand, many of the zealous, but candid and conscientious advocates of Voluntaryism, while they may still condemn the union of Church and State, and may be even more than ever opposed to compulsory endowments, are ready to acknowledge that in looking too much at Government as “the creature of man,” they may have overlooked it as “the ordinance of God,” and may have been tempted to forget, though they never meant to abandon, the principle of national responsibility; and that now, waiving the question of endowments, they agree with us in holding that Christian men, in their civil and social as well as personal capacities, are bound to regulate themselves by the Divine will, and act in subserviency to the glory of Christ, the King of Zion. On the other hand, the most ardent and able defenders of endowments have not only been obliged practically to renounce them, but have been insensibly led, from their new position, to take a calmer survey of the advantages and disadvantages of that system for which they once

contended as *pro aris et focis*. Without dropping a single principle for which they did battle within the pale of the National Church, they are not disposed to take such high ground in maintaining the duty, the desirableness, or the necessity of having at all times an establishment. They are, in short, more anxious to secure national religion than to set up national Churches; more solicitous that our rulers should act in accordance with the laws of Scripture than to become themselves stipendiaries of the State. Nor are these more vague ambiguous sayings, leaving the parties really as distant from each other as before; they are, we solemnly believe, the utterances of Christian minds, touched with "the same spirit of faith," and "walking by the same rule," because they "mind the same thing."

We may safely advance a step farther, and assert that, in Scotland at least, their late struggle for independence, and their experience of State patronage, have opened the eyes of many of the friends of Establishments to the peculiar perils attending that connexion, and to the inefficiency of the most stringent legal securities for the conservation of the spiritual liberties of the Church, when these securities have been rather concessions wrung from the reluctant hands of despotism than cordial recognitions of spiritual independence. And indeed, without at all condemning the policy of our fathers in soliciting the sanction of the State to their standards of belief and forms of discipline—policy which was dictated by their peculiar situation, placed as they were between the machinations of priestcraft and the usurpations of monarchy,—we may be allowed to question its general wisdom, and the propriety of its application to every period of the Church. In the event of any future negotiation with the State, were such a thing at all likely, the ancient guarantees would no longer be accepted as sufficient. Besides, it would not be difficult to show that the formal sanction by the State, of the profession made by the Church, is inconsistent with the proper idea of an *alliance* between Church and State. In entering into an alliance with any foreign power, Great Britain would surely hold it foul scorn to ask her ally to sanction her laws. It is enough that the allied States acknowledge each other's independence. Our fathers, no doubt, meant nothing more than this; but they calculated too much on the good faith of men in power; and, with all their logical acumen in defining the respective spheres of authority, they seem to have never anticipated that the magistrate, being in his own province supreme, if called upon to give his official impress to the deeds of the Church, would naturally step from the position of the ally into that of the sovereign, and, in the act of sanctioning her laws, would regard himself as imposing his laws upon her. When the monarch came forward, in stately

dignity, to touch with the royal sceptre the Acts of the Church of Scotland, it is not surprising that he should have felt himself for the time to be acting the superior. The danger lay, not where our Voluntary friends have laboured to find it, in the alliance formed between Presbytery and the Government, but in the Church submitting her laws to be sanctioned by, and incorporated with the laws of the State; instead of demanding, as from an ally, a simple and distinct recognition of herself as an independent kingdom. To prevail over her enemy, she allowed herself to be saddled and bridled by a treacherous usurper, who was sure to turn the transaction to his own advantage.

By these remarks, we do not condemn the securities obtained at the Reformation for the Protestant *religion*. Religion we hold to be a fair subject for legislation—but not the Church. And here we are surely entitled to look for a general agreement among the friends of truth. It cannot really be held by any right-minded Christian that Government has nothing to do with religion. That sentiment has been distinctly, and, we believe, heartily repudiated by many who are anxious to be accounted Voluntaries. Let it then be granted, on the one side, that the Christian ruler is bound, in his official character, to regulate himself by Christian principles, to do all in his power for the advancement of the truth; and that it is the duty of nations to own the authority of the highest Lord. Let us no more hear such Pilate-like questions started as—What is truth? or Who is to be the judge of it? Then is the way open for the admission, on the other side, that though religion, as being common to both Church and State, ought to be recognised by the latter as the best friend of man, and the firmest pillar of society, yet the Church, as being a spiritual and independent kingdom, cannot be legislated for by another kingdom, further than to have her independence acknowledged and settled by law. In this simple distinction between religion and the Church—between the divine life and the organized body—may not a *via media* be found on which the friends of Christ may yet join hands and keep step in the march of Christian freedom? And may not even the vexed question of endowments be settled among them, theoretically, on the same amicable terms? What repels and alarms the one party here, is not merely the elevation by the other of the mere mode of supporting the pastors into a Christian ordinance, which it must be sinful to violate, but such assertions as that the endowment of truth and of error are equally sinful, and that in no case may Government grant supplies of money for religious purposes. But few will deny that, in certain states of society, the endowment of any one corporation of Christians may become highly inexpedient; and the

question of support might be made to rest on the duty of maintaining the independence of the Church.

Entertaining such views, it was, we confess, with no ordinary interest that we looked forward to the publication now before us. The position, the character, the principles, so far as hitherto developed, of the estimable author, led us to anticipate that, "now, after so long a time," the Christian world might be conducted to common ground, on which, under the standard of "Union in the Truth," all the genuine friends of Zion might gather their forces, and dropping their respective banners of dissidence, might form one universal Free Church of the three kingdoms. Our expectation in this respect has been disappointed; but the work itself is of too much importance, and bears too much on the probable destinies of the Church, to pass without our special consideration.

This volume issues from the press under circumstances of more than ordinary interest and notoriety. On no mind, we are persuaded, have the mere adjuncts of his recent separation from the Church of England produced less impression than on that of the excellent author himself. To these he has hardly made a passing allusion in the massive work now before us; and those who may look into it with the expectation of finding a philippic on his personal treatment by the Bishop of London, will go away as much disappointed as the crowds who, from a similar motive, flocked to hear the farewell discourses at his chapel. The Christian public, however, will not easily forget, that no sooner had Mr. Noel, with the frankness so congenial to his character, announced his intention of leaving the communion of the English Church, expressing at the same time a desire to remain till his flock was provided with a suitable successor, than he was peremptorily silenced by his diocesan. If anything had been wanting to bring out, with lurid distinctness, the anti-evangelistic spirit of that Church, it would have been supplied by this specimen of the infatuated policy of its rulers, who, while they will forbear, up to the last moment of their nominal adhesion to the Church, with Anglo-Catholics, even after they have avowed their Popish predilections to their superiors, will seize the first opportunity to pounce on an evangelical clergyman, when, from excess of candour or of conscientiousness, he gives them the slightest pretext for the exercise of discipline.

Another circumstance which will intensify the effect produced by his work, much more than the modesty of the author will allow himself to believe, is the high status which he occupies in the Christian world. In the eyes of all good men he shines as a star of the first magnitude. The name of Baptist Noel, familiar as a household word, is associated with "whatso-

ever things are true" in the faith, " whatsoever things are honest" in purpose, " whatsoever things are just" in conduct, " pure" in motive, " lovely" in spirit, and " of good report" with all men at home and abroad. Independent of his rank in society, the voice of the Christian public has conferred on him the insignia of spiritual nobility, and, in despite of his Church, raised him to the episcopate of talent and of piety. With such a character, as far beyond the patronage of his opponents to confer as it is beyond their power to denude him of it, Mr. Noel has occupied a position the most favourable perhaps of all others for an impartial view of his subject. Born and nurtured in the Church of England, of which he has been now for twenty years the popular idol and the ornament, he had no temptations to scan with invidious eyes the corruptions of that " venerable institution," while, at the same time, he has enjoyed the best opportunities of becoming fully acquainted with its real condition. To none, certainly, will his own brethren, who still remain in the English Establishment, deploring its abuses, listen with more candour and attention. To them his book is specially addressed; and those without the pale of the Church will read it chiefly from curiosity to ascertain what impression it is likely to produce on those within.

Few acquainted with the sentiments of Mr. Noel, expressed in his former publications, will be surprised at the step he has taken; all must be interested to know how he has vindicated that step, and what position he now means to occupy. On opening the volume with such feelings the reader may be somewhat disappointed. The author does not profess to give reasons for his procedure; these are rather left to be inferred from the whole tenor of his reasonings. He lays down ample ground certainly for his secession, but he does not explain how he has been so long in making up his mind to occupy that ground. In fact, the book might have been written by one who had never been a member of the Church of England, and who wrote rather to warn others against entering its gates, or to invite them to " come out and be separate," than to vindicate himself for having resolved, after tarrying so long within the city, to retreat from it as far as possible. Nor is it very easy to guess the final resting-place which he contemplates. All this we might set down to that forgetfulness of self which seems singularly developed in the ardent and enthusiastic temperament of the author. But we have not proceeded far into the volume before we are struck with another peculiarity, not so easily accounted for. The title is " *The Union of Church and State;*" but while the entire argument of the book is directed against " the Union," in whatever form it may be supposed to exist, the form of Union described is

that only which exists in the Church of England. Thus, at the very commencement, he says :—

“ I have, then, to inquire, in the following pages, whether it is the will of Christ, as deducible from the Word of God, that the Christian congregations of this country should receive the salaries of their pastors from the State, and *be consequently placed under its superintendence.*”

On this side the Tweed at least, the criminal, if not rightly described in the indictment, escapes scot-free from the bar. The union here defined may be the English Union, but it is certainly not the union of Church and State which *our* reformers recognised, or which any enlightened advocates of establishments would vindicate in our country. It is, indeed, exactly the theory of an Establishment upon which the law courts proceeded in condemning the acts of the Scottish Church, and the prosecution of which, in the highest court of civil appeal, issued in the late memorable Disruption. How Mr. Noel, who came so generously to the aid of the Non-intrusionists on the question of independence, should have adopted a theory which, if true, would stultify all the contendings of that party for freedom while within the pale of the National Church, is a question which he affords us no means of deciding. He takes the whole point then in dispute for granted, and professes only to argue with those who hold that “ the State is competent to protect and *superintend* the Church.” We are driven, therefore, to one of two conclusions—either that Mr. Noel is now convinced that the State payment of salaries to the pastors necessarily involves State patronage and supremacy, and that, consequently, the Church of Scotland before the Disruption took up an untenable position in her contest for independence; or that, leaving this point undecided, and assuming that the State *de facto* claims supremacy over the Church, as an inseparable sequence of its support, he reasons, in fact, against the Union viewed in this complex form. The first supposition would imply such an amount of presumption in the absence of all proof, that we prefer the second, more especially as the whole work is directed against the Erastian Union of Church and State as exemplified in England.

At the same time, it is too obvious that, with the Church of England in his eye as the *beau idéal* of “ the union,” Mr. Noel is opposed to all forms of ecclesiastical establishments, and has, unwittingly, but naturally, adopted, to nearly all their extent, the arguments and objections of the Voluntary school. In one important particular we were glad to find him taking up a position which shows that he is not prepared to plunge into all the conclusions which have been drawn from Voluntary principles. He

admits "it may be very true that Governments ought, by all means in their power, to advance the cause of Christ," and says:—

"Each Member of Parliament is no less bound to make the law of God the exclusive rule of his public conduct. Each public measure should be considered with reference to the Divine will; each vote should be given in the fear of God; and every legislator is called to avow that he is governed in all things by the authority of Christ. The same principle should obviously govern the united action of all the members of the State. *They must legislate and govern in the fear of God, according to Scripture, for the glory of God and the good of the nation.*" —Pp. 22, 23.

This doctrine will, doubtless, be hailed by many as depriving Voluntaryism of its sting, and as admitting the main principle which they consider to be endangered by that system. Nor do we think that any enlightened friend of Establishments *in this country* would hesitate to subscribe to what our author states as the last Christian duty of Governments, viz., that "they no less owe it to their Lord and Redeemer to leave his Churches free from all secular control, to intrude no ministers upon them, to impose no tax on the reluctant for the purposes of religion, and to use no coercion whatever of their subjects in any religious matters." The paragraph following this may well, however, startle them, as somewhat inconsistent with the above:—

"Thus, if the State were wholly Christian it ought to abolish its Union with the Churches. But is it Christian? How many Members of Parliament profess to trust wholly to Christ for their salvation from hell, and therefore make his Word their exclusive rule of conduct? If the majority are without this faith they are unchristian and ungodly; and the Union between the Church and State is the Union between the Churches of Christ and a body of unconverted men—it is the Union of the Church with the world. And since all who are not with Christ are against him, it is the union of his friends with his enemies. The effect of the Union does not depend upon what the State ought to be, but upon what it is; and to advocate the Union because the State is bound to be evangelical, is the same thing as to say that a thief should be made the trustee of a property because he is bound to be honest, or that the Lord's Supper should be administered to a drunken profligate because he is bound to be virtuous and sober. The advocates of the Union constantly argue, not from what the State is, but from what it ought to be, and infer most erroneously the effect of the Union of the Churches with the actual State, from what they suppose would be the effect of their Union with the Utopian State. The actual State is irreligious, and the Churches are bound to dissolve their Union with it."—Pp. 24, 25.

The amiable author is certainly guilty of some confusion of thought here. The legitimate conclusion, even from his own

premises, is not that "*if the State were wholly Christian, it ought to abolish its union with the Churches*"—but that, if the State ought to be "*governed in all things by the authority of Christ,*" it *will* abolish its union with the Churches. This may be true, or it may not; but Mr. Noel was not warranted to shift from this ground, which refers to the *duty* lying on every State, whether Christian or not, to the actual *character* of the existing State. The question is not what legislators ought to be, but what legislators ought to do. None that we know of "*advocate the Union because the State is bound to be evangelical;*" though some may maintain that the State is bound to support evangelical religion. The instances of the thief and the profligate are, therefore, out of place. The personal character of the rulers, or the actual character of the Government, may be such as to render a union with the Church both dangerous and inexpedient. But the duty of the State, whatever that may be, remains unaffected by its character, or by the course which the Church may see meet to pursue. The same error of confounding the character with the duty of statesmen, appears in his remarks on the "*Constitution of the State.*" And here we regret to find it involving him in a statement which, however it might sound on the hustings, comes from the lips of Baptist Noel on our ears with singular dissonance.

"Is the world spiritual or unspiritual, regenerate or unregenerate? If unspiritual and unregenerate, why should they choose spiritual men to represent them in Parliament? I will add, that it ought not to be otherwise. If we are to be well governed, the House of Commons should gather to itself the greatest capacities in the kingdom. A religious man without talent is no more fitted to be a senator, than a religious man without muscle is fitted to be a blacksmith; and electors should no more choose a Christian without sound political knowledge to direct the nation, than a Government should choose a Christian without knowledge of navigation or of gunnery to command a man-of-war. Our rulers ought to be men of ability, and if they have sound morals, this is all that can be generally asked."

To those familiar with the controversy which lately agitated this country, it must be superfluous to point out the various fallacies lurking under these few unhappy sentences. For the sake of others, we beg to put the following plain questions to our much esteemed author. Granting that the majority of our electors are unspiritual men, does this necessarily imply that the constituency or State of Great Britain is "*the world*" condemned by Scripture as "*lying in wickedness?*" If so, how can Christian men belong to that constituency? and does not their connexion with the State as members of it involve as much incongruity as any "*union of Church and State*" that ever existed?

Does Mr. Noel not confound "the world" as the secular society, "out of which he must needs go" altogether, if he would avoid all connexion with it—with "the world" as the sinful society, out of which Scripture commands him to go even while he remains in the other society? Is there any necessary connexion between what is secular and what is sinful? And are civil governments inevitably sinful because they are inevitably secular? Again, does the prevailing irreligious character of electors release them from the obligation of choosing as representatives "men fearing God and hating covetousness?" or are Christian electors not bound to see that such men represent them? In fine, granting that "our rulers ought to be men of ability," and that religion will not compensate for the absence of talent, does it follow that talent will atone for the absence of religion? or are we warranted to expect that the affairs of the nation will be crowned with the Divine blessing, if conducted without any regard to the Divine law?—No! we may conceive Mr. Noel as replying to these queries on further reflection; these are consequences which I cannot entertain for a moment, and I now perceive that I must be wrong, and that it must be as much the duty of electors to choose good men, as it is the duty of our representatives (not *to be* good men, but) *to act* as good men; for I maintain that "they must legislate and govern in the fear of God, according to Scripture, for the glory of God, and the good of the nation."

We cannot leave this part of the subject without expressing our regret, that before proceeding to advocate the dissolution of the union of Church and State, our author should not have recognised, more plainly and heartily, the moral character of government as an ordinance of God, and the duty of nations to Him who is "King of kings and Lord of lords." It is here, we conceive, that the grand defect of his work lies. In his conclusions as to the duty of the *Church* in such times as those we live in, few will refuse to concur who are not interested in the abuses which he has exposed. But in his views as to the duty of governments, and of Christians in regard to them, we can assure him he is radically mistaken, and will find himself opposed by the best friends of civil and religious liberty. The author himself, if closely questioned, would be the first, we should suppose, to shrink from the allegation, that between two candidates equally qualified in other respects, it mattered little whether the man of mere "navigation and gunnery" were chosen, or the man whose well known character would be his pledge and our guarantee that in all his public actings he would be regulated by a sacred regard to the interests of the God of the Bible, of the Sabbath, and of the Church.

Nor can we sufficiently regret that in the very outset of his book Mr. Noel should have considered it necessary to indicate, in such strong terms, his leanings to the Congregational system of Church polity. In his introduction he has been at pains to define the meaning of the word "Church," in attempting which he gives too obvious evidence of being more indebted to the late treatises of Doctors Wardlaw and Davidson, than to an impartial course of reading on the subject. It is surely of small importance to the present question, in what sense the word "Church" or assembly is employed in the New Testament. It is a convenient phrase, which is not more sacred than many other scriptural phrases, and which it is no more unscriptural to apply to an assembly of Christians united under one form of discipline, than to an assembly of Christians united under one roof. Mr. Noel, however, rejects the use of the phrase, "Church of England," as if the word were thereby profaned, and his argument compromised. "I shall speak of the Roman Catholic Churches, and the Greek Churches, of the Scotch Establishment, of the English Establishment, or of the Churches within these Establishments; not of the Church of Rome, the Greek Church, the Church of Scotland, or the Church of England." This might pass as a trifling peculiarity, amounting, indeed, on the theory which Mr. Noel seems to have embraced, to something like a *reductio ad nihilum*, for his new friends, the Independents, would hardly acknowledge any of the congregations within the English Establishment to be Churches of Christ at all. And had we been critically inclined, we might have adverted to the inconsistency shewn in denying the use of the collective term Church to the religious establishment, while he has no difficulty in applying that of State to the civil establishment. If we can conceive, and may be permitted to speak of the visible complex body, including "the legislative and executive powers," the crown, the ministers, Houses of Parliament and constituency, as the "State," why may we not conceive and speak of the equally visible body, composed of professing Christians, as the "Church?" And surely it is of the Church as a visible, and not as an invisible society, that Mr. Noel speaks, when treating of "the Union of Church and State." It is impossible to speak of such a union intelligibly, without using the phrase as descriptive of the religious in contradistinction to the secular society; and accordingly, besides exhibiting it on his title, he has frequently, in the course of his book, been betrayed into the expression.* But our author has

* The following is one example among many of this unconscious forgetfulness of his Congregationalism:—"If 'the earth' means the European population gene-

given still more decided evidence of his leanings to the congregational polity in other passages; and symptoms appear of a disposition to go more than half-way even with the Baptists. Unwilling to dwell on this theme, we refer the reader to pages 146, 212, 325, 436, 460, 486, 514.*

What we chiefly deplore, however, is the effect which this unhappy ultraism and indecision of tendency must have on the minds of his former brethren. If not deterred from following his example by the length of the leap he has taken, they must be all the more content to linger with the abuses he has denounced, when it is seen that, in Mr. Noel's opinion at least, there is no intermediate ground, no sure footing, between an outrageous Erastianism, crushing under its iron-heel every fibre of life and freedom in the Church, on the one hand, and on the other, a nomadic unorganized Dissenterism; no alternative between the Establishment as it now stands, with all its corruptions, and an ecclesiastical revolution which would not only dissolve the Union of Church and State, but dissolve the Union of the Church herself, and explode her into ten thousand fragmentary churches, as unlike as unallied to each other, and the prospective constitution of which no man could foretell. The English mind seems hitherto unable to devise a middle path between the purest despotism and the rankest radicalism in ecclesiastical matters. We had hoped to find in Mr. Noel's book a more moderate scheme of reform projected, which might have reconciled the two extremes; but we are compelled to say that we despair of him as a leader in any great movement of reformation, when we see him thus merging himself in the confused ranks of existing dissent—descending into the arena, single-handed, as the champion not of the Church but of a chapel—and pleading, with all the ardour of a neophyte, for a system of disunion and disorganization, the utter impotence of which for any combined action, even its veteran supporters were beginning to deplore.

We shall not therefore follow our author into his lengthened discussion on the separation of Church and State. We are not aware that he has introduced a single new argument. When

rally, and 'the woman' represents the Church of Christ, it shews that *the Church* may receive help from the people in any country, but the nature of the help is left undetermined. It may be the duty of nations to *help the Church* in one way, but unlawful to seek to help it in another. It may be right for them to *protect it from violence*, while it is wrong to *fetter it* (that is, *the Church*) by a Legislative Union," &c., p. 126. This must refer to the visible Church; for the Church invisible does not admit of being either helped or fettered.

* "I do not find in the New Testament any other church court than the Church itself [*i.e.* the congregation] under the presidency of its elders."—P. 460. "Not a word is said in Scripture, clearly and explicitly, about the baptism of infants."—P. 436.

we state that his reading seems to have been limited on the side of Establishments to such writers as Hooker, M'Neile and Gladstone, our readers will not feel surprised that he should have adopted the views of "Wardlaw, Ballantyne, Conder, Gasparin, Vinet and Baird." And when it is kept in mind that his idea of an establishment is thoroughly Erastian, that he argues against what he calls the "State Episcopate," it need hardly be said that our advocates of establishments, whose reading and reflection are not "almost all on one side," will readily admit the force of the "General Considerations" which he has drawn from "the Constitution of the State," "the parental relation," from "history," from "Old Testament prophecies," and from "the New Testament," as quite applicable to such a union as that which he takes for granted.

The same remark applies to the latter, and by far the most important part of the volume, which refers to the "Effects of the Union." The fearful disclosures made in this portion of the work, of the inefficiency, the bondage, the corruption, and the baneful results of the system, when applied to that particular form of the Union which exists in England, are certainly fitted to create, and must leave, a deep impression on the mind of every Christian reader. This Part is divided into the "Influence of the Union upon Persons"—such as bishops, pastors, members, dissenters; and the "Influence of the Union upon Things"—such as the number of ministers, maintenance, doctrine, discipline, evangelization, union, reformation, religion, government, and other national establishments. Under each of these heads the influence of the Union is brought out with great power and effect; though, throughout the whole, no distinction is ever suggested between "the Union" itself, and "the Union in England." The impression left on our mind indeed, is the utter hopelessness of seeing such corruptions removed while such a connexion continues to exist. But we regret that the author should have exposed his well-intentioned arguments to be met, not by any attempts at reforming the Union as it is, but by a volley of counter-arguments in behalf of the Union as it should be; and that the odium which his *exposé* may, with too much justice, enhance against the Establishment will only be confronted by references to the growing attachment of multitudes to the Church established. There is a delusion here which, we fear, the friends of established abuses are destined sooner or later to discover; for if, after such an unfolding of the depth and extent of the disease, no remedial attempt is made, the body must sink into that state of collapse in which neither the skill of the physician nor the affection of friends can save it. Meanwhile, this concentration of attack upon the Union of

Church and State, as the sole cause of all the corruptions of the former, savours too much of the empiric and the visionary, to prove effective in the proper quarter. It may call forth *Jo peans* from a certain class of dissenters; but will the blow be fatal to Establishments? We doubt it greatly.

"The Union of the Churches with the State is doomed," says Mr. Noel; and, for aught we know, the prediction may be a true one, though we do not think the prophet has taken the best way to ensure its fulfilment. Had he come forth in the character of a Reformer of his native Church, denouncing the Union simply because he despaired of seeing her abuses removed while such a species of Union remained, and zealous to restore her to a purity and vigour outrivalling the days of the Sixth Edward, of Jewel and Latimer and Cranmer,—he might have enlisted the best sympathies of Old England in the cause of spiritual independence. As it is, he has to fight his way against English patriotism as well as English pride; and the issue of such a conflict is more than doubtful.

The bomb has exploded within the citadel; but the effect on those within, who still constitute the majority, can only be to stimulate their zeal in its defence. It must always be an impolitic, if not an unfair mode of warfare against the corruptions of a Church, to trace up all of these to a single source, however profound in error, or prolific of evil that source may be. It may be true that the corruptions may never be effectually reformed while that source remains untouched,—just as the wounded warrior cannot be healed till he has been disencumbered of the armour which frets the sore and impedes the operation; but it does not follow that all the disorders which cry for remedy flow from one fountain, or will vanish on its removal. The grand origin of the evils affecting the English Church, it might be easy to shew, lies not in its being an Establishment simply, but in its having been, to a sad extent, from the very beginning, an establishment of abuses. Romish errors, never sufficiently purified by the Reformation, were consolidated and perpetuated by the despotism of Elizabeth, and have lain to this day congealed as in the iceberg of a long Arctic winter. Drifted as it has been lately within the influence of another spring, is there not some hope of seeing it thawed and broken up, and reduced to its original elements? And if so, is it not the office of all the friends of that Church, and of the truth as it is in Jesus, to see that due preparation is made to "separate the precious from the vile," and build up, from among the wreck of scattered abuses, a second Temple more glorious, because more spiritual and simple and godlike, than the first?

But we must conclude our rapid review. As a specimen of

the author's style, we select the following passages in which he brings out, with withering effect, some of the most glaring faults of the Establishment which he has left :—

INFLUENCE OF THE UNION UPON BISHOPS.

“From this enumeration of some of the functions of a prelate imposed by the State, it is too obvious that a pastor suddenly raised by the fiat of the premier to the prelatic dignity, must undergo temptations of no ordinary force. How can one, whose position was so humble, become at once so lofty without giddiness! That smile of a statesman has made him at once a peer, the master of a palace, the owner of a lordly revenue, the successor of apostles. Thenceforth he shines in Parliament, and moves among the most splendid circles of the wealthiest nation of the earth; or, retiring to his palace, he administers within its baronial precincts an extended patronage, wields an absolute sceptre over one-third of his clergy, and by an indefinite prerogative, awes and controls the rest; meets with no one to question his opinions or contradict his will; and may look along a lengthened vista of enjoyments to the more dazzling splendour and prerogatives of Lambeth. If a man, under these circumstances, is not deteriorated, he must have extraordinary wisdom and virtue. But when worldly men are chosen by the Government, and are rendered more worldly by the disadvantages of their position, their distribution of livings, their visitation charges, their circuits for confirmation, their private intercourse with the clergy, and their whole influence, must check evangelical religion, and add to the numbers of worldly and unsound incumbents throughout the land.”—Pp. 273-275.

The following is a severe, but we suspect not an overdrawn picture of

THE PIOUS ANGLICAN PASTOR.

“He may exaggerate the importance of the Union, extol ‘the Church’ as the purest and best in the world, persuade himself that it is the chief bulwark of Protestantism; he may fill up his time and thoughts with the duties of his ministry, and may resolve not to read, speak, or think on those disputed topics. Thus he may strive to hide out the errors of the prayer-book, and avoid every conclusion respecting the legal fetters of his ministry, shielding himself under the thought that many excellent men do all that he is called to do, and that matters so trifling ought not to endanger an institution so venerable and so necessary.

“Symptoms of this state of mind are, I think, common.

“Amongst pious Anglican pastors it is common to hear strong and even violent denunciation of Popery, which requires no courage, because the thunderer launches his bolts against a despised minority, and is echoed by admiring multitudes. But the ten thousand practical abuses within the Establishment wake no such indignant thunders,—the nomination of worldly prelates,—the exclusion of the Gospel from thousands of parishes in which by the Union ungodly ministers

have the monopoly of spiritual instruction,—the easy introduction of irreligious youths into the ministry,—the awful desecration of baptism, especially in large civic parishes,—the more awful fact, that thirteen thousand Anglican pastors leave some millions of the poor out of a population of only sixteen millions utterly untaught,—the hateful bigotry of the canons, which excommunicate all who recognise any other Churches of Christ in England except our own,—the complete fusion of the Church and the world at the Lord's table,—the obligation upon every parish minister publicly to thank God for taking to himself the soul of every wicked person in the parish who dies without being excommunicated,—the almost total neglect of scriptural Church discipline,—the tyranny of the license system,—the sporting, dancing, and card-playing of many clergymen,—the Government orders to the churches of Christ to preach on what topics, and to pray in what terms, the State prescribes,—the loud and frequent denunciation of our brethren of other denominations as schismatics,—the errors of the Articles and of the prayer-book, and the invasion of the regal prerogatives of Christ by the State supremacy,—the total absence of self-government, and therefore of all self-reformation, in the Establishment, &c. &c. &c.† all these enormous evils are tolerated and concealed. Dissenters are often and eagerly attacked because comparatively weak; but scarcely a tongue condemns the tyranny of the State towards the Anglican Churches, because the State is strong and holds the purse.”—Pp. 309-302.

The following is his melancholy account of

THE ACTUAL STATE OF THE ESTABLISHMENT.

“If the 16,000 pastors and ministers of the Anglican Churches were living according to these divine commands, England would soon turn to Christ.

“But what is the actual state of the Establishment? Myriads of its members have nothing of Christianity but the name, received in infancy by baptism, and retained without one spontaneous act of their own; and millions do nothing whatever to promote the cause of Christ. Its 13,000 churches are generally without evangelistic activity, without brotherly fellowship, without discipline, without spirituality, without faith. Like Laodicea, they are lukewarm; like Sardis, they have a name to live and are dead. Of its 16,000 ministers, about 1568 do nothing; about 6681 limit their thoughts and labours to small parishes, which contain from 150 to 300 souls; while others in cities and towns profess to take charge of 8000 or 9000 souls. And of the 12,923 working pastors of churches, I fear, from various concurrent symptoms, that about 10,000 are unconverted men, who neither preach nor know the Gospel.”—Pp. 568, 569.

MR. NOEL'S CONCLUDING ADDRESS.

“The Union of the Churches with the State is doomed. Condemned by reason and religion, by scripture and by experience, how can it be allowed to injure the nation much longer? All the main principles

upon which it rests are unsound. Its State-salaries, its supremacy, its patronage, its compulsion of payments for the support of religion, are condemned by both the precedents and the precepts of the word of God. We have seen that it sheds a blighting influence upon prelates, incumbents, curates, and other members of churches. It adds little to the number of pastors, it distributes them with a wasteful disregard to the wants of the population, and it pays least those whom it ought to pay most liberally. It excludes the Gospel from thousands of parishes; it perpetuates corruptions in doctrine; it hinders all scriptural discipline; it desecrates the ordinances of Christ, confounds the Church and the world, foment schism among Christians, and tempts the ministers of Christ both in and out of the Establishment to be eager politicians. Further, it embarrasses successive Governments, maintains one chief element of revolution in the country, renders the reformation of the Anglican Churches hopeless, hinders the progress of the Gospel throughout the kingdom, and strengthens all the corrupt papal Establishments of Europe.

“Worst of all, it ‘grieves’ and ‘quenches’ the Spirit of God, who cannot be expected largely to bless the Churches which will not put away their sins.

“But when it shall be destroyed, we have reason to hope that the churches will revive in religion speedily. Sound doctrine will then be heard from most of the Anglican pulpits; evangelists will go forth into every part of the land; scriptural discipline will be restored; schisms will be mitigated; Christian ministers will cease to be political partisans; we may look for a larger effusion of the Spirit of God; and England may become the foremost of the nations in godliness and virtue.

“Let all who fear and love God arise to accomplish this second Reformation. The work which our martyred forefathers began in the face of the dungeon and the stake, let us, in their spirit, complete!

* * * * *

“Since many will hold back from even an examination of truths which entail momentous consequences to themselves, each disciple of Christ, who ascertains the separation of the Churches from the State to be his Master’s will, must count it an honour to serve him singly, if need be, in this conflict. Great events in history have waited on the actions of a few intrepid men. Hampden, by his resolute resistance to an act of tyranny, awoke in his countrymen the spirit which secured our liberties. The gallantry of Clive saved our Indian empire. Luther long thought and laboured almost alone. The extensive revival of the last century was owing, under God, to Wesley and Whitfield, with very few companions. Let each member of the Establishment, therefore, who comprehends this duty, determine that he will, without waiting for the decision of others, do his utmost in the name of Christ to secure the freedom of the Anglican Churches from the shackles of the State.

* * * * *

“With greater confidence I address my brethren of the free churches. There should be no longer disunion or sloth. Indepen-

dents and Baptists, Wesleyans and members of the Free Church of Scotland, let us all, with united voices, from Caithness to Cornwall, claim, in the name of Christ, the Christian liberty of the British Churches; and this generation may yet see accomplished a second Reformation more spiritual, and not less extensive, than the first.

"Above all, let us take care to fulfil this duty in a Christian spirit. No religious cause requires irreligious means for its advancement. Let us disgrace ourselves by no railing, condemn all personal invective, and be guilty of no exaggeration, for these are the weapons of the weak and the unprincipled; but, uniting with all those who love the Redeemer, let us recognise with gratitude every work of the Spirit within the Establishment as well as without it. And with much prayer, with constant dependence on the Holy Spirit, with a supreme desire to glorify God, and with an abundant exercise of faith, hope, and love, which are our appropriate armour in every conflict, let us persevere in our efforts till the blessing of God renders our triumph a decisive step towards the evangelisation of the world."—Pp. 627-631.

Alas, for the Church of England! the first-born of our Reformation, and the beginning of our strength! Time was when "men would have healed her, but she is not healed!" Time was when she might have kept her bulwarks by surrendering her palaces—and retained all her real beauty and spiritual efficiency, at the sacrifice of her trappings. Time was, at the critical juncture of the Restoration, when by a moderate reform of her hierarchy, liturgy and canons, she might have retained her emoluments without losing her liberties, and might have seen a virtuous hardworking clergy, distributed through her much loved island,—

"In bright succession raised, her ornament and guard."

But in an evil hour, she yielded to the dictation of a perfidious and unprincipled tyrant, who robbed her of her strength under pretext of advancing her to worldly honours; and now, undermined within, and besieged without, she is fain to cling for support to the arm of her oppressor. Saving the pledged and interested supporters of things as they are, none can believe that this can continue long. If the Church is destined to stand, it will be by the energies of her own children, awakened to a sense of danger and duty by the signs of the times, and demanding a thorough reform, both in her relations to the State, and her internal administration. If she is doomed to fall, it will not be by the assaults of her enemies, but by her own weight—by the plethora of wealth and power flowing to the head, and forsaking the extremities; and by clinging, with infatuated fondness, to those ponderous abuses, which, unless parted with, will assuredly drag her downwards with them into the weltering waters of revolution.

ART. V.—*The History of England, from the Accession of James II.* By THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY. In 2 vols. London, 1849. 1300 pp.

WE have never perused a work of literature or science, or even one of fiction, with such an intense interest as that with which we have devoured the two remarkable volumes now before us. We have cheated our mind of its usual food, and our body of its usual rest, in order to grasp, by one mental effort, the great truths which they teach, and imbibe the noble lessons which they convey. Were we among the personal friends of Mr. Macaulay, or did we adopt the latitudinarian views of religious truth which he has presented to us in all the fascination of language and of sentiment, we might have suspected that our judgment was partial, and our admiration extravagant; but, though our Presbyterian feelings have been often offended, and our most venerated martyr's but slightly honoured, and our national creed not unfrequently reviled, yet these penumbral spots disappear, while we study in his bright and eloquent pages the vindication of our country's liberties,—the character and the fate of the sages who asserted them,—and the righteous but terrible doom of the Princes from whom they were wrung.

There is no period of the History of England in which the events are so closely related to those of the present day as the few years of oppression and judicial murder which constitute the reign of James II. In watching at present the revival of Popery, and in resisting its insidious approach, we must study its spirit and its power previous to the Revolution; and in contemplating our domestic disturbances, and the political convulsions which are now shaking the civilized world, we may discover their cause and their cure by a careful study of Mr. Macaulay's volumes. In the arbitrary rule of the House of Stuart—in the perfidy and immorality of its princes—in the bigotry and licentiousness of its priests—in the venality of its statesmen—and in the blood-thirstiness of its captains—we see the germ of that revolutionary tempest which swept into one irresistible tide the otherwise conflicting elements of society. The Giant of Reaction, in his most grim and savage form, summoned a patient and oppressed people to revolt, and with its scorpion lash hurried one sovereign to the scaffold, and another into exile.

But while we shudder over the recitals in which these crimes are emblazoned, and through which our liberties were secured, the mind searches for some powerful principle of action to which they can be referred. Why was the prince perfidious, the

judge sanguinary, and the priest corrupt? It was because an idolatrous superstition reigned in Christendom—irritated at the progress of *Protestant* truth—inculcating the heresy of passive obedience to kings—exercising an authority over the souls and bodies of men—usurping the sceptre, and assuming the ermine of the Church's Head—sealing the ark of divine truth—and closing or poisoning the fountains of education and knowledge. In the lap of this superstition even Protestant England slumbered. Truth, secular and divine, had indeed begun to throw its mingled radiance among the ignorant and immoral masses of English life. It had long before gilded and braced the Scottish mind, and raised the Scottish heart to a sense of its duties and its wrongs. The noble doctrines of the school of Calvin, which Scripture taught and philosophy confirmed, had been accepted as the creed of Presbytery, and formed the basis of its simple discipline and worship. Through the unity and power of her faith, and the indomitable courage of her people, the Church of our fathers would have maintained her ground against all the power of the Papacy, if wielded only by her domestic princes; but the Union of the Crown of Scotland with that of England, which in happier times has been the source of her glory and her strength, threw her back a century in the race of civilisation and knowledge.

A despicable king, in carrying off its Crown, forgot his duty to the land which gave him birth, striving to overturn its blood-cemented Church, and launching against its priesthood and its people the formidable power of his double sovereignty. Her humble temple fell beneath the sword of the tyrant, but only to rise again with a nobler pediment and a loftier peristyle. The same godless princes who had desecrated our altars and slain our martyrs lifted their blood-stained hand against the Sister Church; but they lifted it in vain, for their dynasty perished in the wreck of the superstition which they upheld. Under a Protestant race of kings, and a Protestant constitution, the Sceptres of England and Scotland have been welded into one. Their Churches have flourished and grown together—the one rich and powerful—the other humble and contented. Their literature and science—their trade and their commerce—their arts and their arms—have achieved throughout the civilized world a glorious and imperishable name. We have now nothing to fear from perfidious and criminal sovereigns, from unprincipled statesmen, from venal judges, or from sanguinary chiefs. We have nothing to fear from political turbulence. The progressive reform of our institutions, and their gradual accommodation to the ever-varying necessities of man, and the ever-changing phases of social life, can always be secured by the

moral energy of an educated and religious people. We have still less to fear from foreign invasion. The diffusion of knowledge, and the local approximation and mutual interests of nations, have exorcised the spirit of war; and should it reappear, with its iron vizor and its bloody drapery, we have bulwarks of steel and of oak that may defy the hostile levies of the world. But we have much to fear from that gigantic superstition which has so often erected the stake and the scaffold in our land, and which is again girding itself for the recovery of its power. Crowds of its devotees have been long stationing themselves in our towns and villages. Idolatrous altars are rising thick around us. The Upas seeds of Papal error, long concealed in the rubrics and liturgies of a neighbouring Church, have already begun to germinate—now hiding their blanched vegetation from the eye of day—now rising up in rank luxuriance—now budding under the surplice—now bearing fruit under the mitre. The breath of a bigoted minister, or the fiat of an unprincipled monarch, is alone wanting to plant the poison-tree in our land, and renew the battle of faith which was waged and won by our fathers.

It is not probable that such a direct agency will be employed, but there are crooked lines of policy by which treason finds an easier and a quicker path to its crimes. There may be a minister, and there may be a parliament, so blind to religious truth, so ignorant of the lessons which history has read to them, and so reckless of the temporal and spiritual interests which they control, as to supply with the munitions of war the enemies of our Faith, and thus arm a Catholic priesthood against a Protestant shrine, and marshal a wild population against the peace and liberties of the empire. Had we at the helm of State some modern Orpheus, who could charm with his lyre of gold the denizens of the moral wilderness, or some Indian sage who could cajole the poison-tooth from the snake in the grass, we might expect by a stipendiary bribe to loose the Jesuit from his vows, or the priest from his allegiance; but history proclaims to us, by a handwriting on the wall, what the experience of the nation confirms, that every concession which truth makes to error is but a new buttress to support it, and that every shackle which toleration strikes from fanaticism, adds but to its virulence and power. To our Roman Catholic brethren we would cheerfully extend every right and privilege which we ourselves enjoy—to every civil and military office we would admit them—with every honourable distinction we would adorn them. Whatever, indeed, be his creed, we would welcome the wise man to our board, and we would clasp the good man to our bosom—some modern Augustine if he exists—some living Pascal if he is to be found; but we

would never consent, even under the torture-boot of James II., to pay out of the hard earnings of Protestant toil the stipend of a Catholic priest, or build his superstitious altar, or purchase the relics of his idolatry.

We have no desire to support these views by any arguments of our own. We are content to refer our readers to the truth-speaking and heart-stirring pages of Mr. Macaulay. In his history of James II., every fact has but one meaning, every event but one tongue, and every mystery but one interpretation. We here learn that with civil liberty Popery cannot co-exist.—With Scripture truth it is utterly irreconcilable.—With the faith of science it is at variance.—To the spread of education and knowledge it is bitterly opposed.—From the sage equally as from the novice it demands the secrets of the life and the heart; and over the domestic sanctuary, the seat of the purest and holiest of our affections, it has exercised, and insists upon exercising, the control of a parent, and it has wielded, and insists upon wielding, the sceptre of a god.

Gathering these truths from the work before us, and entertaining the opinion which we do of its transcendent merits, we cannot but record our satisfaction at the rapid and extensive circulation which it has already obtained, and express the wish that it may adorn every library and enlighten every family in the kingdom. And notwithstanding the imperfections which in our eyes it bears, and the errors of opinion which to us it occasionally exhibits, and the hard judgments which it sometimes pronounces against truths which we accept and revere, we would yet wish to see it in an abridged form, diffusing through middle life its great truths and lessons, and we should not object to have it read in our schools, and studied in our universities, as the best history of our Revolution, and the safest expositor of our civil and religious liberties.

As Mr. Macaulay's *History of England* is to be brought "down to a time which is within the memory of men still living," it will no doubt include the chronicle of the Great Revolution, which, at the close of the last century, subverted European dynasties, and which, after being itself subverted, has re-appeared with redeubled energy, threatening the extinction, or heralding the improvement, of every political institution. The path of the historian will therefore lie among thorns and quicksands, exposing him to the assaults of vindictive factions—of men rushing headlong to change, or checking the march of that great civilisation which the highest oracles have taught us to anticipate. The manner in which Mr. Macaulay has traced his course through the intricacies of our own revolutionary period is the best earnest of his future success; and though we sometimes start at what is perhaps

only the shadow of secular leanings, when he refers to conflicting creeds, and treats of ecclesiastical strife, we yet look forward with confidence, and even with delight to his future labours. It is difficult for a statesman embroiled in the politics of his own day, and committed often to party opinions which he does not himself hold, to descant freely and consistently on the events of other times, and to protect those stern decisions which he pronounces for posterity, from the taint of passing interests and contemporary feeling. Mr. Macaulay has, in our judgment, stood clear of this Scylla and Charybdis of history, and we feel assured that even his political adversaries will not venture to assert that he has chronicled the reign of James II. with the temper of a partizan, or sought to magnify his own political opinions by distorting the facts or suppressing the truths of history.

The first volume of the work, which we shall now proceed to analyze, is divided into *five* chapters. In the *first*, Mr. Macaulay gives a condensed and elegant sketch of English history from the earliest times to the Revolution in 1660. In the *second* chapter, he details the leading events in the reign of Charles II. In the *third*, he describes the state of England at the accession of James II., treating of its statistics, its literature and science, its arts, its agriculture, manufactures and commerce, the state of its towns and villages, and the condition of its population; and in the remaining *two* chapters, he gives the history of the last of the Stuarts, which is continued and concluded in the *five* chapters of the second volume.

The great event of the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity is justly regarded by Mr. Macaulay as the "first of a long series of salutary revolutions" which laid the foundation of that noble constitution by which England has been distinguished from other nations. The predominance of the sacerdotal over the civil power, which marked this early period of our history, and which was continued for a great length of time, he conceives to have been a real blessing to "a society sunk in ignorance, and ruled by mere physical force." Viewing the power of priestcraft as *mental*, and "that which naturally and properly belongs to intellectual superiority," he pronounces it to be "nobler and better than that which consists merely in corporeal strength;" and as the priests were by far the wisest portion of society, he decides "that it was on the whole good that they should be respected and obeyed, and that their dominion in the Dark Ages had been, in spite of many abuses, a legitimate and a salutary guardianship." Even "the spiritual supremacy arrogated by the Pope in the Dark Ages is held to have been productive of far more good than evil;" and Mr. Macaulay reaches the

climax of his admiration, when he expresses his doubt *whether a purer religion might not have been found a less efficient agent in accomplishing* "that revolution which, in the thirteenth century, put an end to the tyranny of nation over nation, and that revolution which, a few generations later, put an end to the property of man in man."

Although we regard these laudations of sacerdotal and papal supremacy, and of the pilgrimages, and sanctuaries, and crusades, and monastic institutions of the Middle Ages, as an oblation to the political liberalism of the hour, and as a stumbling-block at the very threshold of Mr. Macaulay's labours, we yet feel some difficulty in reducing such general assertions into a proposition which can be fairly analyzed. That the ascendancy of *mental power* as a principle of government is superior to "that which consists merely in corporeal strength," or, as elsewhere expressed, to that which governs "by vigour of muscle, and by audacity of spirit," is a truth too palpable to be denied. But when we express it in another form, and aver that the government of Popery, as exercised in the Middle Ages, was better than that of a purer faith, and better, too, than that of the muscular and audacious baron, who, in the same age, led his hereditary bondsmen to battle, there is not a Protestant versed in history that will not give it an indignant denial.

The mental power to which we do homage in the statesman and lawgiver is essentially different from the mental power of the priest. The one is the effluvia of a god embodied in the sage to bless and elevate his species,—the other the spirit of Belial displayed in fraud and imposture—in false legends and in lying miracles. Under the priestly sway, knowledge was placed in bond for the purposes of deception. The viceregent of Heaven encouraged crime by absolving the criminal, and the moral and mental power which he thus wielded descended unimpaired to his successors, and is potently exercised at this moment over every kingdom in Christian Europe. A purer religion than this—the faith of Luther, or even the faith of Pascal and Arnaud, would doubtless have been a more efficient agent in the civilisation of mankind. But even the audacious autocrat exercised a sway more humane and improving than that of the priest. He laid no embargo upon knowledge—he put forth no claim to divine power, and he transmitted none to his race. If he fell in battle, a son or a chieftain less warlike than himself was not prevented by his caste from acquiring and diffusing a taste for the arts of peace, and from exercising a milder sway over his serfs. If he returned from conquest, he might import some new ideas from his enemies, or bring back some refined or intellectual captive, or introduce into his fastnesses some instrument or process of civilisation,

But if the audacious prince was a less humane and enlightened ruler than the priest,—if the prelate St. Dunstan was a nobler character than the warrior Penda, whence arose the formidable contrast? The priest himself was the cause. He it was that intercepted the rays of civilisation and science, which Heaven was gradually shedding over our race. He it was that selfishly converged them into the gloomy crypt of his sanctuary, and dispensed them at an usurious interest in magic and in jugglery, to deceive and enslave mankind. There was indeed a species of learning which emanated from the hierarchy duty free. They not only tolerated but taught the botany of the holy thorn, the osteology of saintly vertebræ, the odontology of the Virgin, and the physiology of St. Januarius' blood; and every monastery and temple had its museum of crowns and vestments, of ropes and chains, of crucifixes and crosses, of teeth and toes, labelled in duplicates and triplicates to establish their mendacious legends. It was thus that knowledge nestled in the monasteries, and thus that science was contraband in the baronial hall.

Did our narrow space permit us to continue the discussion of this subject, we would present it to our readers under another phase. We would direct their attention to the Chronicles of Arabia, and the noble Institutions which, during the Dark Ages, sprang up under the religion of the Crescent. When a corrupt superstition, as Mr. Macaulay allows it to be, was blighting with its sirocco currents the green buds of secular knowledge, and imprisoning within their fruit-vessel the long ripened seeds of sacred truth, the Caliphs of the East, the depositaries of physical force, and the heroes of many battles, were introducing among the ferocious Saracens the elements of Art and Science, and establishing schools and academies for the instruction of the children of the Prophet. A Christian physician, unfettered by Mohamedan tests, presided over the academy of Khorasan, composed of men of all countries and creeds. The orthodox Mussulmans indeed murmured at the liberality of their princes, but the Arabian youth resorted to the gymnasium, and neither his academies nor his colleges were denounced as godless. Such were the labours of Almamon. With a "vigour of muscle, and an audacity of spirit" not inferior to that of any of the captains of his age, he drew his sword against his enemies, but he returned it to its scabbard, more eager than before for the instruction and civilisation of his subjects.

As if conscious of the weakness of his position, Mr. Macaulay re-states his heresy with modifying expressions, and contents himself with the affirmation, "that that superstition (namely, the Catholic) cannot be regarded as *unmixedly noxious*" which creates an aristocracy altogether independent of race, and

compels the hereditary master to kneel before the spiritual tribunal of the hereditary bondsman." To the proposition in this form we willingly assent. There is no superstition unmixedly noxious,—no institution, either social or political, in which something innocuous may not be found. Even in slavery, the climax of institutional baseness, we may contrast the African in chains braving the horrors of the middle passage, with the slave spending the rest of his life under the roof of a kind and even a Christian master.

Among the causes by which England was, at an early period, advantageously distinguished from most of the neighbouring countries, Mr. Macaulay, in a very interesting passage, mentions the relation in which the nobility stood to the commonalty :—

"There was," he says, "a strong hereditary aristocracy, but it was of all hereditary aristocracies the least insolent and exclusive. It had none of the invidious character of a caste. It was constantly receiving members from the people, and constantly sending down members to mingle with the people. Any gentleman might become a peer. The younger son of a peer was but a gentleman. Grandsons of peers yielded precedence to newly made knights. The dignity of knighthood was not beyond the reach of any man who could by diligence and thrift realize a good estate, or who could attract notice by his valour in a battle or a siege. It was regarded as no disparagement for the daughter of a duke, nay, of a royal duke, to espouse a distinguished commoner. * * * Good blood, indeed, was held in high respect; but between good blood and the privileges of the peerage, there was most fortunately for our country no necessary connexion. Pedigrees as long, and scutcheons as old, were to be found out of the House of Lords as in it. There were new men who bore the highest titles. There were untitled men well known to have been descended from knights who had broken the Saxon ranks at Hastings, and scaled the walls of Jerusalem. * * * There was, therefore, here no line like that which in some other countries divided the patrician from the plebeian. The yeoman was not inclined to murmur at dignities to which his own children might rise. The grandee was not inclined to insult a class into which his own children must descend. * * * The constitution of the House of Commons tended greatly to promote the salutary intermixture of classes. The knight of the shire was the connecting link between the baron and the shopkeeper. On the same benches on which sat the goldsmiths, the drapers, and grocers who had been returned to Parliament by the commercial towns, sat also members who, in any other country, would have been called noblemen, hereditary lords of manors, entitled to hold courts, and to bear coat armour, and able to trace back an honourable descent through many generations. Some of them were younger sons and brothers of great lords. Others could boast even of royal blood. At length the eldest son of an Earl of Bedford, called, in courtesy, by the second title of his father, offered himself as candidate for a seat in the

House of Commons, and his example was followed by others. Seated in that House, the heirs of the grandees of the realm naturally became as zealous for its privileges as any of the humble burgesses with whom they were mingled. Thus our democracy was, from an early period, the most aristocratic, and our aristocracy the most democratic in the world; a peculiarity which has lasted down to the present day, and which has produced many important moral and political effects."—Vol. i. pp. 38-40.

After briefly referring to the government of the Plantagenets and Tudors, Mr. Macaulay treats of the Reformation and its consequences. He finds it difficult to say whether England owes more to the Roman Catholic religion or to the Reformation, and yet he admits that, "for political and intellectual freedom, and for all the blessings which political and intellectual freedom have brought in their train, *she is chiefly indebted to the great rebellions of the Laity against the Priesthood.*" The origin and peculiar character of the English Church, and the relation in which it stood to the State, next passes under review. He points out the advantages which the Crown derived from an Establishment which inculcated the doctrine of passive obedience, and describes the indignation of the Puritans when they saw "an Institution younger by many years than themselves, and which had under their own eyes, gradually received its form from the passions and interests of a Court, begin to mimic the lofty style of Rome."

"Since these men," (the Puritans,) says Mr. Macaulay, "could not be convinced, it was determined that they should be persecuted. Persecution produced its natural effects upon them. It found them a sect; it made them a faction. To their hatred of the Church was now added hatred of the Crown. The two sentiments were intermingled, and each embittered the other. The opinions of the Puritan concerning the relation of ruler and subject were widely different from those that were inculcated in the homilies. His favourite divines had both by precept and example encouraged resistance to tyrants and persecutors. His fellow Calvinists in France, in Holland, and in Scotland, were in arms against idolatrous and cruel princes. His notions, too, respecting the government of the State, took a tinge from his notions regarding the government of the Church. Some of the sarcasms which were popularly thrown on Episcopacy, might without much difficulty be turned against royalty; and many of the arguments which were used to prove that spiritual power was best lodged in a synod, seemed to lead to the conclusion that temporal power was best lodged in a parliament. Thus, as the priest of the Established Church was from interest, from principle, and from passion, zealous for the royal prerogatives, the Puritan was from interest, from principle, and from passion, hostile to them."—Vol. i. pp. 60, 61. *

On the death of Elizabeth in 1603, the Crowns of Scotland and England were united in the person of James I., a mean and

pusillanimous prince, a presumptuous pedant, and a stickler for the divine right of kings. His son Charles I., while he surpassed his father in understanding, surpassed him also in bigotry. Adopting the political theories of his sire, he strove to carry them into practice; and in attempting to convert the government of England into a despotism, and to establish Episcopacy in Scotland, he lost at once his life and his Crown.

"It would be unjust," says Mr. Macaulay, "to deny that Charles had some of the qualities of a good, and even of a great prince. He wrote and spoke, not like his father, with the exactness of a professor, but after the fashion of intelligent and well-educated gentlemen. His taste in literature and art was excellent, his manner dignified though not gracious, his domestic life without blemish. Faithlessness was the chief cause of his disasters, and is the chief stain on his memory. He was, in truth, impelled by an incurable propensity to dark and crooked ways. It may seem strange that his conscience, which on occasions of little moment was sufficiently sensitive, should never have reproached him with this great vice. But there is reason to believe that he was perfidious, not only from constitution and from habit, but from principle. He seems to have learned from the theologians whom he most esteemed, that between him and his subjects there could be nothing of the nature of a mutual contract; that he could not, even if he would, divest himself of his despotic authority; and that in every promise which he made there was an implied reservation that such promise might be broken in case of necessity, and that of the necessity he was the sole judge."—Vol. i. pp. 83, 84.

With a counsellor like the Earl of Strafford, cruel and imperious in his nature, and a spiritual guide like Archbishop Laud, fanatical and malignant, and the unrelenting persecutor of non-conforming piety, it was no wonder that the Sovereign was hated by his people. Tyranny, civil and ecclesiastical, prevailed. Obsequious judges sacrificed law and equity at the will of their monarch, and the Star Chamber and the High Commission, "guided chiefly by the violent spirit of the Primate, and freed from the control of Parliament, (which had not been convoked for eleven years,) displayed a rancidity, a violence, a malignant energy, which had been unknown to any former age." By such agencies the opponents of the Government were imprisoned, pilloried, and mutilated. The whole nation was agitated and incensed. The persons and liberties of Englishmen were imperilled; and such was the general despair, that men who feared God, and would have obeyed a righteous king, quitted the country which they loved, and sought and found an asylum in the Transatlantic wilds. Amid forests which the hand of man had neither planted nor reared—under the shelter of the oak and the pine, whose pedigree stretched back into primeval times—within the

reach of the Indian's tomahawk, and in the jungle ringing with the cries of the beasts of prey, did the aristocracy of England's faith lay the foundation of the cities of the West, and give birth to a race of freemen, to avenge on a future generation of their oppressors the wrongs of their fathers.

At this emergency the insane bigotry of the King and the Primate took the fatal step which led to their ruin. In the "mere wantonness of tyranny, and with a criminal contempt of public feeling, they resolved to force upon Scotland a liturgy more Popish than that of England, and to this rash attempt," as Mr. Macaulay justly observes, "our country owes her freedom." A riot took place at the first exhibition of the hated ceremonial. The nation rose to arms. The Scots marched into Yorkshire. The English troops "were ready to tear the hated Strafford to pieces," and the hapless King was compelled to abandon his arbitrary purpose, and call to his aid the wisdom of Parliament. The Star Chamber and the High Commission were abolished; the dungeons and prisons were thrown open; the wicked counsellors of the wicked King were impeached. Strafford was imprisoned, and afterwards executed; Laud was sent to the Tower, tried by the Lords, and executed;* and the Lord Keeper Finch saved himself by flight.

In order to pacify our justly indignant countrymen, Charles visited Scotland in 1641, and put his sign-manual to an act declaring Episcopacy to be contrary to the Word of God! The enemies of Prelacy were thus encouraged to oppose it; and when the Parliament re-assembled in October 1641, it was split into two formidable parties, the Cavaliers and Round-heads—the faction of the King and of the people. In the one were marshalled the Roman Catholics—the frivolous votaries of pleasure, "who affected gallantry, splendour of dress, and a taste in the lighter arts"—together with the poets, the painters, and the stage-players, "down to the rope-dancer and the Merry-Andrew." In the other were combined the members of the English Church who were still Calvinistic, the Protestant non-conformists, the municipal corporations, with their merchants and shopkeepers, the small rural freeholders, headed by a "formidable minority of the aristocracy, including the rich and powerful Earls of Northumberland, Bedford, Warwick, Stamford, and Essex." The rebellion of the Roman Catholics in Ulster gave strength to the popular party. The remonstrance of the Commons against the royal policy, the base impeachment of the five leaders of the House, and the attempt of Charles in person to seize them by armed force within the walls of Parliament, inflamed the zeal of the Whigs, brought

* Mr. Macaulay has omitted to mention the trial and execution of Laud.

down upon the perfidious King the execration of his people, and forced him to fly from his stormy capital, to return only to a harsh and terrible doom.

The story of the Civil war, and of the Protectorate of Cromwell—of the trial and execution of Charles I. as “a tyrant, a traitor, a murderer, and a public enemy”—of the march of General Monk and the army to London—of the restoration of Charles II., and of his triumphal return to the throne of his fathers, is briefly and eloquently told by Mr. Macaulay.

The reign of the restored monarch had an auspicious commencement. Recalled by the consent of opposing factions, and regarded with a romantic interest from his personal sufferings and adventures, an opportunity was afforded for exhibiting the noblest virtues of a king, and embalming a righteous prerogative in the affections and liberties of his people. But it was otherwise decreed. Charles had neither the head nor the heart of a prince. Without the ambition of fame, he thought as little of making England great, as he did of making its people free. Without the guidance of faith, he cared little about religion; and without the restraints of conscience, he cared less about morality.

“He had,” says Mr. Macaulay, “received from nature excellent parts and a happy temper. His education had been such as might have been expected to develop his understanding, and to form him to the practice of every public and private virtue. He had passed through all varieties of fortune, and had seen both sides of human nature. He had, while very young, been driven forth from a palace to a life of exile, penury, and danger. He had, at the age when the mind and the body are in their highest perfection, and when the first effervescence of boyish passions should have subsided, been recalled from his wanderings to wear a crown. He had been taught by bitter experience how much baseness, perfidy, and ingratitude may lie hid under the obsequious demeanour of courtiers. He had found, on the other hand, in the huts of the poorest true nobility of soul. When wealth was offered to any who would betray him; when death was denounced against all who should shelter him, cottagers and serving men had kept his secret truly, and had kissed his hand under his mean disguises with as much reverence as if he had been seated on his ancestral throne. From such a school it might have been expected that a young man who wanted neither abilities nor amiable qualities would have come forth a great and good king. Charles came forth from that school with social habits, with polite and engaging manners, and with some talent for lively conversation. Addicted beyond measure to sensual indulgence; fond of sauntering and of frivolous amusements, incapable of self-denial and of exertion; without faith in human virtue, or in human attachment; without desire of renown, and without sensibility to reproach. According to him, every

person was to be bought. * * * Thinkin', thus of mankind, Charles naturally cared very little what they thought of him. Honour and shame were scarcely more to him than light and darkness to the blind. His contempt of flattery has been highly commended, but seems, when viewed in connection with the rest of his character, to deserve no commendation. It is possible to be below flattery as well as above it. One who trusts nobody will not trust sycophants. One who does not value real glory will not value its counterfeit.

"It is creditable to Charles's temper that, ill as he thought of his species, he never became a misanthrope. He saw little in man but what was hateful. Yet he did not hate them. Nay, he was so far humane that it was highly disagreeable to him to see their sufferings or to hear their complaints. * * * The facility of Charles was such as has perhaps never been found in any man of equal sense. He was a slave without being a dupe. Worthless men and women to the very bottom of whose hearts he saw, and whom he knew to be destitute of affection for him, and undeserving of his confidence, could easily wheedle him out of titles, places, domains, state secrets, and pardons. He bestowed much; yet he neither enjoyed the pleasure nor acquired the fame of beneficence. He never gave spontaneously; but it was painful to him to refuse. The consequence was, that his bounty generally went, not to those who deserved it best, nor even to those whom he liked best, but to the most shameless and importunate suitor who could obtain an audience."—Vol. i. pp. 167-170.

In his political character Charles had no resemblance either to his father or his brother. The doctrines of divine right and passive obedience made no appeal to his prejudices. Unfit for business, he detested and shunned it in every form; and such was his ignorance of affairs, that the very clerk of council often sneered at his silly remarks and his childish impatience. In his religious character he stood aloof, not perplexed, but indifferent, between the two bundles of hay—Infidelity and Popery. In his social and moral character he is not easily described. He was as little impressed by kindnesses as he was annoyed by injuries, and hence gratitude was not numbered among his virtues, nor revenge among his faults. His master-passion was to enjoy a life of undisturbed repose, and to riot among the pleasures that make life a paradise, and Eternity a torment.

That the reign of such a prince would be turbulent and disastrous might have been readily anticipated. That it would be disgraceful to the honour of the king and the nation could scarcely have been foreseen. To curb the ambition of the French king and support the Protestant cause in Europe, England had entered into the Triple Alliance with the States General and Sweden. The English Parliament and both sections of the people had loudly applauded this salutary union of Protestant States, but the king viewed it as but a temporary concession to

popular opinion. Anxious to be emancipated from constitutional control, he looked to the power and riches of France for the accomplishment of his views; and, with the approbation of the Duke of York, the heir to the throne, he opened a negociation with the French king. Through his sister, the beautiful Henrietta, Duchess of Orleans, he offered to declare himself a Roman Catholic, to dissolve the Triple Alliance, and to unite in making war against Holland, provided Louis gave him such aid as to make him independent of his Parliament. These welcome propositions were accepted by France, and formed the secret treaty signed at Dover in 1670; and, in order to maintain his ascendancy at the English Court, Louis sent the beautiful Louisa Querouaille, afterwards Duchess of Portsmouth, to direct and control the royal will.

Although this treaty was signed with the concurrence of the *Cabal Ministry*,* yet Charles himself suggested the most degrading of its articles, and concealed most of them from the majority of a Cabinet whose unprincipled compliance he might readily have obtained. Mr. Macaulay has well described these political miscreants. Clifford, the most respectable of them, was "a man of fiery and impetuous temper," with "a strong though a lamentably perverted sense of duty." Arlington, from his vagrant life abroad, was attached to despotism and Popery. Buckingham, a faithless voluptuary and a traitor, "was eager to win the royal favour by services" from which others "would have recoiled with horror." Ashley, full of levity and selfishness, "had served and betrayed a succession of Governments." "Lauderdale, loud and coarse both in mirth and anger, was perhaps, under the outward show of boisterous frankness, the most dishonest in the Cabal. He had been conspicuous among the Scotch insurgents of 1638, and zealous for the Covenant." * * *

He often talked with noisy jocularly of the days when he was a canter and a rebel. He was now the chief instrument employed by the Court in forcing Episcopacy on his reluctant countrymen, nor did he in that cause shrink from the unsparing use of the sword, the halter, and the boot. Yet those who knew him, knew that thirty years had made no change in his real sentiments—that he still hated the memory of Charles I., and that he still preferred the Presbyterian form of Church government to any other." Men of such a character were the fit servants of such a king. They made his Majesty fraudulently profess great zeal for the Triple Alliance. They obtained money from the House of Commons and the Goldsmiths of London on

* The Ministry, in 1671, consisted of Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley, and Lauderdale, the first letters of whose names made the word CABAL.

false and flagitious pretences, and cowering under the wing of the French monarch, they issued the declaration of indulgence, abrogating by royal authority all the penal laws against the Catholics, including also those against Protestant Dissenters. This nefarious measure was, in terms of the secret treaty, followed by the declaration of war against the Dutch.

At this critical juncture there appeared on the stage of European politics a remarkable individual, who was destined, as Mr. Macaulay observes, "to save the United Provinces from slavery, to curb the power of France, and to establish the English constitution on a lasting foundation." William Henry, the posthumous child of William II. Prince of Orange, and Mary, the daughter of Charles I., was the possessor of a splendid fortune, a sovereign prince of Germany, and a prince of the blood-royal of England. The invasion of Holland, the result of the base treaty of Dover, subverted the existing Government. The Grand Pensionary John de Witt was torn in pieces by the rabble, and the Prince of Orange became the head of the State.

"Young as he was," says Mr. Macaulay, "his ardent and unconquerable spirit, though disguised by a cold and sullen manner, soon roused the courage of his dismayed countrymen. It was in vain that both his uncle and the French king attempted by splendid offers to seduce him from the cause of the Republic. To the States-General he spoke a high and inspiring language. He even ventured to suggest a scheme which has an aspect of antique heroism, and which, if it had been accomplished, would have been the noblest subject for epic song that is to be found in the whole compass of modern history. He told the Deputies that, even if their natal soil and the marvels with which human industry had covered it, were buried under the ocean, all was not lost. The Hollanders might survive Holland. Liberty and pure religion, driven by tyrants and bigots from Europe, might take refuge in the farthest isles of Asia. The shipping in the ports of the Republic would suffice to carry two hundred thousand emigrants to the Indian Archipelago. There the Dutch Commonwealth might commence a new and more glorious existence, and might rear, under the southern cross, amidst the sugar-canes and nutmeg trees, the exchange of a wealthier Amsterdam, and the schools of a more learned Leyden. The national spirit swelled and rose high. The terms offered by the Allies were firmly rejected. The dykes were opened. The whole country was one great lake, from which the cities, with their ramparts and steeples, rose like islands. The invaders were forced to save themselves from destruction by a precipitate retreat. Louis, who, though he sometimes thought it necessary to appear at the head of his troops, greatly preferred a palace to a camp, had already returned to enjoy the adulation of poets and the smiles of ladies in the newly planted alleys of Versailles."—Vol. i. pp. 218, 219.

Thus baffled in his designs, Louis could not supply the means of coercing the English press. Parliament assembled in the spring of 1673, after a recess of two years. The country party attacked with consummate skill the policy of the Cabal, and in a short time the declaration of indulgence was cancelled. The test act, excluding Papists from civil and military office was re-enacted, the Cabal was broken up by intestine quarrels and the treachery of Shaftesbury, and the King was compelled to conclude a peace with the United Provinces, and induced to consent to the marriage of his niece, the Princess Mary, with the Prince of Orange.

The peace of Nimeguen, which in 1678 terminated the seven years' war, was speedily followed by a political crisis in England. The passion for civil liberty was rendered more intense by a prevailing sense of national humiliation. The imbecility of her councils, and the thirst of her sovereign for foreign gold, had brought England into just contempt. The introduction of a foreign army was dreaded. A feeling prevailed that a blow was to be struck at the Protestant faith, and that the cruelties of Bloody Mary would again afflict the land. Under the excitement of these feelings, Titus Oates put in circulation his wild romance of a Papist plot to burn London, and to murder the King, his ministers, and the Protestant clergy. The nation was convulsed. The murder of Sir E. Godfrey gave probability to the rumour, and every precaution was taken against the dreaded calamity. Informers and spies added to the general belief, by swearing away the lives of Roman Catholics. The judges, and even statesmen, encouraged the delusion, and the apostasy of the Duke of York induced even the Episcopal clergy to join in the outcry against the Catholics. In this emergency the King called to his counsels Sir W. Temple, who proposed a Privy Council of thirty individuals as the royal adviser; and among the statesmen who were called to carry this new system into effect, were Viscount Halifax and the Earl of Sunderland, whose characters are finely drawn by Mr. Macaulay.

"Among the statesmen of that age," says he, "Halifax was, in genius, the first. His intellect was fertile, subtle, and capacious. His polished, luminous, and animated eloquence, set off by the silver tones of his voice, was the delight of the House of Lords. His conversation overflowed with thought, fancy, and wit. His political tracts well deserve to be studied for their literary merit, and fully entitle him to a place among the English classics. To the weight derived from talents so great and various, he united all the influence which belongs to rank and ample possessions. Yet he was less successful in politics than many who enjoyed smaller advantages. Indeed, those intellectual peculiarities which make his writings valuable,

frequently impeded him in the contests of a rive life. For he always saw passing events, not in the point of view in which they commonly appear to one who bears a part in them, but in the point of view in which, after the lapse of many years, they appear to the philosophic historian. With such a turn of mind he could not long continue to act cordially with any body of men. All the prejudices, all the exaggerations of both the great parties in the State, moved his scorn. He despised the mean arts and unreasonable clamours of demagogues. He despised still more the Tory doctrines of divine right and passive obedience. He sneered impartially at the bigotry of the Churchman and at the bigotry of the Puritans. He was equally unable to comprehend how any man should object to saints' days and surplices, and how any man should persecute any other man for objecting to them. In temper he was what, in our time, is called a Conservative. In theory he was a Republican. Even when his dread of anarchy and his disdain for vulgar delusions led him to side for a time with the defenders of arbitrary power, his intellect was always with Locke and Milton. Indeed, his jests upon hereditary monarchy were sometimes such as would have better become a member of the Calf's Head Club than a Privy Councillor of the Stuarts. In religion he was so far from being a zealot, that he was called by the uncharitable an Atheist: but this imputation he vehemently repelled; and, in truth, though he sometimes gave scandal by the way in which he exerted his rare powers both of argumentation and of ridicule on serious subjects, he seems to have been by no means unsusceptible of religious impressions. * * *

"His understanding was keen, sceptical, inexhaustibly fertile in distinctions and objections; his taste refined; his sense of the ludicrous exquisite; his temper placid and forgiving, but fastidious, and by no means prone either to malevolence or to enthusiastic admiration. * * * Such a man could not long be constant to any band of political allies. His place was between the hostile divisions of the community, and he never wandered far beyond the frontier of either."—Vol. i. pp. 242, 243.

Sunderland did not, like Halifax, belong to the class of politicians called *Trimmers*.* He was a base intriguer, an accomplished flatterer, and the most servile instrument of arbitrary power. "In this man," says Mr. Macaulay, "the political immorality of his age was personified in the most lively manner. Nature had given him a keen understanding, a restless and mischievous temper, a cold heart, and an abject spirit. His mind had undergone a training by which all his vices had been nursed up to the rankest maturity." He had been envoy to the Court of Louis, and from that bad school he came out "cunning,

* Halifax gloried in this nickname, and assumed it as a title of honour, on the principle that every thing good *trims* between extremes.

supple, shameless, free from all prejudices, and destitute of all principle.

The changes introduced by Sir W. Temple had calmed for a while the storm of political agitation, but it soon resumed its violence. The Exclusion Bill, by which the Duke of York, an avowed Papist, was excluded from the succession, was the great object at which the Opposition grasped; but the King frustrated their designs by proroguing the Parliament without the advice of his Council, or even their knowledge that he intended to prorogue it. The day on which this unconstitutional act was perpetrated—the 26th May, 1679, was a day glorious for England. On that day the Habeas Corpus Act received the royal assent, and while the King disowned the House of Parliament he emancipated the press. A dissolution and a general election soon followed the prorogation.

These violent measures gave a new impulse to the Opposition. The Exclusion Bill was demanded in a louder voice; and for the first time the rights of Mary and Anne were assailed. When the King was resident at the Hague, Lucy Walters, a beautiful Welsh girl, had become his mistress, and had borne to him a son. James Crofts, the name of the youth, fortunate in having been assigned to a prince, was received at Whitehall with paternal fondness. Honours shared only by princes were heaped upon him. He was married to Miss Scott, the heiress of Buccleuch, and was created Duke of Monmouth in England, and Duke of Buccleuch in Scotland. Distinguished by his personal beauty and affable manners, and celebrated for his gallantry as a soldier, his return to England was hailed with universal acclamation. It had been rumoured in well-informed circles that Charles had married Lucy Walters, and that Monmouth was the lawful heir to the Crown. The Protestant party naturally gave credit to a rumour which excluded their enemy from the throne, and the condescension and popular manners of Monmouth ingratiated him with the people. In this posture of affairs the Privy Council of Sir W. Temple ceased to exist, and Laurence Hyde and Sidney Godolphin became the advisers of the Crown—the one a rancorous partisan, a violent champion of Church and Crown, and the virulent enemy of Republicans and Dissenters—the other a flexible courtier, hating change either for good or evil, and one who, as Charles expressed it, “was never in the way nor out of the way.”

The year which followed the prorogation in 1679 was pregnant with portentous events. The nation was split into angry factions, and counties, towns, families, and even schools, were similarly agitated: The cry on the one side was to exclude a Papist king—the cry on the other was to support the prerogative. The Pope was burned in effigy. The Covenanters in Scotland,

driven mad by persecution, had murdered Archbishop Sharpe, and risen against the Government; and the French king, bribing and flattering both the Court and the Opposition, "exhorted Charles to be firm, and James to raise a civil war in Scotland, while he exhorted the Whigs not to flinch, and to rely with confidence on the protection of France."

In the new Parliament, which met in October 1680, the Exclusion Bill, opposed by Hyde, and defended by Godolphin, was, without difficulty, passed; but though supported by Shaftesbury, Essex, and Sunderland, in the House of Lords, it was, with the aid of the Bishops, rejected by a great majority, chiefly through the commanding eloquence of Halifax. This defeat of the Opposition was followed by the trial and execution of a Roman Catholic peer, Viscount Strafford, who had been accused as a party in the Popish Plot, and found guilty of treason, on the testimony of Titus Oates and of two other false witnesses.

When Parliament assembled at Oxford in March 1681, a reaction was distinctly visible. A majority of the influential classes began to rally round the throne, and the Whigs were doomed to every species of persecution. The Acts against non-conformists, hitherto dormant, were rigorously enforced. Shaftesbury was tried for high treason, but acquitted. The Earl of Argyle was condemned as a traitor, because he refused to take the test; but he fortunately escaped from prison, and found an asylum in Holland. Pilkington, Colt, and Oates were fined £100,000 for speaking disrespectfully of the Duke of York, and Barnardiston £10,000 for having expressed, in a private letter, sentiments that were considered improper, while Sir R. Wood, who was once Lord Mayor of London, was tried for perjury, and condemned to the pillory, simply because he had given evidence in favour of Pilkington. The Whigs, however, were still powerful and bold. Schemes of resistance, and even of rebellion were projected, and two plots were secretly hatched. The object of the one, to which Monmouth, Russell, and Sidney were parties, was to rouse the nation against an arbitrary Government. The other, which was carefully concealed from them, was the Rye-house plot—the scheme of a few desperate spirits, to assassinate the King and his brother.* The two plots were discovered, and considered as one, and the whole Whig party were involved in the indignation which one of them so justly excited. Shaftesbury had fled to Holland, and died. Monmouth went into voluntary exile. Russell and Sidney, guiltless of the crime for which

* Mr. Fox is of opinion that some of those engaged in this plot had merely a notion of assassinating the King, but doubts whether it ever ripened into a design, or was evinced by such an overt act as was necessary for conviction.—*Hist. James II.*, p. 46.

they suffered, perished on the scaffold—the one with the fortitude of a Christian, the other with the philosophy of a Stoic; and other acts, equally cruel and unconstitutional, everywhere marked the temper and conduct of the Government. The marriage of the Lady Anne to the Prince of Denmark—a man of Protestant principles—raised the hopes of the English Church, and led them to new acts of aggression. The pulpits resounded with harangues against rebellion. The doctrine of Divine Right was the text of many a godless homily, and on the day on which Russell became a martyr to liberty, the fanatical University of Oxford decreed, by a public act, that the great doctrines of liberty were impious, seditious, and heretical, and ordered the political works of Buchanan, Milton, and Baxter to be burned in the court of the schools.

At this memorable juncture there was a student at Christ's Church, Oxford, whose genius and virtue were destined to adorn his country and his age, while they were the means of bringing into disgrace the University which dishonoured and disowned him. John Locke—a name which will survive that of the tyrant and the bishop that oppressed him—was intimately acquainted with Lord Shaftesbury, and was unjustly suspected to have been the author of a pamphlet offensive to the Government. At the command of the King, Sunderland informs Dr. Fell, Bishop of Oxford, that there is “one Locke, who belonged to the late Earl of Shaftesbury,” and who has “behaved very factiously and undutifully to the Government,” and wishes “to know the method of removing him from being a student.” The Bishop replies, that he “has had an eye upon him for divers years,” but can confidently affirm, after strict inquiries, that those most familiar with him have never heard him *speak a word either against or concerning the Government*. Doctors and graduates, as the Bishop unblushingly confesses, had, in public and private, introduced conversations “to the disparagement of his master, the Earl of Shaftesbury, his party and designs,” but could never discover in the student *a word or a look* as if he took any concern in the matter. His immediate expulsion was demanded, and the Dean and Chapter made haste to obey.* “In this instance,” says Mr. Fox, “one would almost imagine there was some instinctive sagacity in the Government of that time, which pointed out to them, even before he had made himself known to the world, the man who was destined to be the most successful adversary of superstition and tyranny.”

While the factions who were struggling for power were each

* The history of this tyrannical act, fully given by Mr. Fox, with all the documents, took place on the 15th November 1684. It is, we suppose by mistake, placed by Mr. Macaulay in the reign of James II., and without any date.

promised in their turn the support of the Sovereign, an event occurred which produced a mighty change on the political condition of England. The health of Charles had begun to give way, and at the close of 1684, a slight attack of gout was the prelude to a severe illness which had a fatal termination. The circumstances under which this took place, and the event itself, are beautifully related by Mr. Macaulay:—

“The palace had seldom presented a gayer or more scandalous appearance than on the evening of Sunday the 1st of February 1685. * * * The great gallery of Whitehall, an admirable relic of the magnificence of the Tudors, was crowded with revellers and gamblers. The King sat there chatting and toying with three women, whose charms were the boast, and whose vices were the disgrace, of three nations. Barbara Palmer, Duchess of Cleveland, was there, no longer young, but still retaining some traces of that superb and voluptuous loveliness which, twenty years before, overcame the hearts of all men. There, too, was the Duchess of Portsmouth, whose soft and infantine features were lighted up with the vivacity of France. Hortensia Mancini, Duchess of Mazarin, and niece of the great Cardinal, completed the group. She had been early removed from her native Italy to the Court where her uncle was supreme. His power, and her own attractions, had drawn a crowd of illustrious visitors round her. Charles himself, during his exile, had sought her hand in vain. No gift of nature or of fortune seemed to be wanting to her. Her face was beautiful with the rich beauty of the South, her understanding quick, her manners graceful, her rank exalted, her possessions immense; but her ungovernable passions had turned all these blessings into curses. She had found the misery of an ill-assorted marriage intolerable, and fled from her husband,—had abandoned her vast wealth, and after having astonished Rome and Piedmont by her adventures, had fixed her abode in England. Her house was the favourite resort of men of wit and pleasure, who, for the sake of her smiles and her table, endured her frequent fits of insolence and ill humour. Rochester and Godolphin sometimes forgot the cares of State in her company. Barillon and St. Evremond found in her drawing-room consolation for their long banishment from Paris. The learning of Vossius, the wit of Waller, were daily employed to flatter and amuse her. But her diseased mind required stronger stimulants, and sought them in gallantry, in basset, and in usquebaugh. While Charles flirted with his three sultanas, Hortensia's French page, a handsome boy, whose vocal performances were the delight of Whitehall, and were rewarded by numerous presents of rich clothes, ponies, and guineas, warbled some amorous verses. A party of twenty courtiers was seated at cards round a large table, on which gold was heaped in mountains. Even then, the King complained that he did not feel quite well. He had no appetite for his supper; his rest that night was broken, but on the following morning he rose, as usual, early. * * *

" Scarcely had Charles risen from his bed, when his attendants perceived that his utterance was indistinct, and that his thoughts seemed to be wandering. Several men of rank had, as usual, assembled to see their Sovereign shaved and dressed. He made an effort to converse with them in his usual gay style; but his ghastly look surprised and alarmed them. Soon his face grew black; his eyes turned in his head; he uttered a cry, and fell into the arms of Thomas Lord Bruce, eldest son of the Earl of Aylesbury. A physician, who had charge of the royal retorts and crucibles, happened to be present. He had no lancet, but he opened a vein with a penknife. The blood flowed freely, but the king was still insensible. He was laid in his bed, where during a short time the Duchess of Portsmouth hung over him with the familiarity of a wife. But the alarm had been given. The Queen and the Duchess of York were hastening to the room. The favourite concubine was forced to retire to her own apartments."— Vol. i. pp. 429-432.

Physicians, Whig as well as Catholic, were admitted to the dying king. After a copious bleeding, hot iron was applied to the head, and " a loathsome volatile salt, extracted from human skulls, was forced into his mouth;" and when he recovered his senses, " he complained that he felt as if a fire was burning within him." His medical attendants were replaced by his spiritual advisers. The Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Bath and Wells offered him the last rites of their Church, but he would not declare that he died in her communion, and he refused the Eucharist from their hands. At the instigation of the Duchess of Portsmouth, through the French Ambassador Barillon, the Queen asked the King if she should bring a Catholic priest. " For God's sake do," replied the dying man, " and lose no time." Father Huddleston was introduced to the death-chamber by a private stair, and administered extreme unction and the Lord's Supper to the King, who thus declared by the last act of his life that he died a Roman Catholic. On the morning of Friday the 6th of February, he apologized to his attendants for the trouble he had caused. " He had been," he said, " a most unconscionable time dying, but he hoped that they would excuse it." " This was the last glimpse," says Mr. Macaulay, " of that exquisite urbanity so often found potent to charm away the resentment of a justly incensed nation." His speech soon after failed him, and he died at seven without a struggle.

Before commencing the history of James II., Mr. Macaulay introduces a Chapter of 150 pages on the state of England at the death of Charles II. This chapter evinces great research, and will be perused with a high degree of interest by many classes of readers. But however much we have been gratified with its brilliant pictures and its instructive details, we are of opinion, that a disserta-

tion of this kind is an unnecessary appendage to a work of history, and, if deemed essential by the author, that it should have formed an introductory chapter. In our progress through Mr. Macaulay's fascinating narrative, we have found it an obstruction in our path; and have felt somewhat as a lover of the picturesque would feel were he taken into a penitentiary and a cotton-mill, in order that he might understand why the peasantry were moral and the villages populous. The object of the chapter is "to correct some false notions which would render the subsequent narrative unintelligible or uninteresting;" but we felt no want of the information which it contains, while we perused the chapters which precede it, and have obtained no advantage from it in perusing those which follow. To describe the condition of England as it ought to be described, in all its interesting relations, would require a range of knowledge which the historian cannot be supposed to possess; and we can expect only that department of it to be well executed which is most intimately connected with the author's studies and opportunities of observation. In his lively sketch of the state of Literature and the Fine Arts, Mr. Macaulay has been singularly successful, but he has as singularly failed in his account of the Sciences and Useful Arts. Misapprehending, as all literary men do, the precise value of the labours of Bacon, he has formed a most erroneous estimate of their influence on the progress of the Physical Sciences. His praise of Sir Isaac Newton is exaggerated, indiscriminating, and incorrect. We have striven in vain to understand what Mr. Macaulay means by *the New Philosophy*; and we are equally at a loss to fathom his allusion to "the long series of glorious and salutary reforms" which the Royal Society was destined to effect.

In contrasting the present with the past condition of England, Mr. Macaulay might have spared a passing eulogy to those illustrious philosophers and inventors, to whom alone she owes her present gigantic attitude of civilisation and power. It was not to statesmen and orators, and still less to historians, and poets, and painters, that we owe the mighty change which Mr. Macaulay has described;—it was to the Watts, and Arkwrights, and Brindleys—to the Bradleys and Herschels,—to the Cavendishes, and Davys, and Wollastons, and Youngs, those lofty columns which compose the Portico of the British Temple of Science, and whose proud names are imperishably united with the glory and greatness of their country. Had Mr. Macaulay thus appreciated the services of his countrymen, he would doubtless have viewed with sympathy that large and distinguished class of intellectual labourers who, without national encouragement or support, are striving, as he once strove, to advance the literature and science of England; and having in his eye the constitution of that Royal Society

which is sustained by the annual clarity of philosophers themselves, he would have called the attention of the Government, to which he belongs, to those noble academical associations, patronized by continental Powers, in which all the genius of the nation is generously marshalled for its intellectual service, and to that just appreciation of mental glory under which the savans even of despotic governments are permitted to share in the honours and offices of the State. But on these subjects the voice of eloquence is dumb. Raised to a high niche in the Elysium of the State, Mr. Macaulay looks down from his azure canopy upon the chill and troubled regions, where genius and learning are allowed to vegetate, to wither, and to die.

Notwithstanding our gentle criticism on Mr. Macaulay's statistical chapter, we are sorry that we cannot indulge our readers with some specimens of its excellence. His portraits of the swearing and drinking old country squire, of the domestic chaplain, of the parochial clergy, and of the mounted highwayman of the time, are finely drawn and full of interest. We shall make room for his description of the least and most worthy of these public characters.

"The mounted highwayman, a marauder known to our generation only from books, was to be found on every main road. * * * The Cambridge scholars trembled when they approached Epping-forest even in broad day-light. Seamen who had been just paid off at Chatham, were often compelled to deliver their purses on Gadshill, celebrated, near a hundred years earlier, by the greatest of poets as the scenes of the depredations of Poin and Falstaff. * * * It was necessary to the success, and even to the safety of the highwayman, that he should be a bold and skilful rider, and that his manners and appearance should be such as suited the master of a fine horse. He therefore held an aristocratical position in the community of thieves, appeared at fashionable coffee-houses and gaming-houses, and betted with men of quality on the race-ground. Sometimes, indeed, he was a man of good family and education. A romantic interest therefore attached, and perhaps still attaches, to the names of freebooters of this class. The vulgar eagerly drank in tales of their ferocity and audacity—of their occasional acts of generosity and good nature—of their amours—of their miraculous escapes—of their desperate struggles—and of their manly bearing at the bar, and in the cart. Thus it was related of William Nevison, the great robber of Yorkshire, that he levied a quarterly tribute on all the northern drovers, and in return not only spared them himself, but protected them against all other thieves; that he demanded purses in the most courteous manner—that he gave largely to the poor what he had taken from the rich—that his life was once spared by the royal clemency, but that he again tempted his fate, and at length died, in 1685, on the gallows of York. It was related how Claude Duval, the French page of the Duke of Richmond, took to the road, became captain of a formidable gang,

and had the honour to be named first in a royal proclamation against notorious offenders—how at the head of his troops he stopped a lady's coach in which there was a booty of £400—how he took only £100, and suffered the fair owner to ransom the rest by dancing a coranto with him on the heath—how his vivacious gallantry stole away the hearts of all women—how his dexterity at sword and pistol made him a terror to all men—how at length in 1670 he was seized when overcome by wine—how dames of high rank visited him in prison, and with tears interceded for his life—how the King would have granted a pardon, but for the interference of Judge Morton, the terror of highwaymen, who threatened to resign his office unless the law were carried into full effect—and how, after the execution, the corpse lay in state, with all the pomp of sentcheons, wax lights, black hangings, and mutes, till the same cruel judge, who had intercepted the mercy of the crown, sent officers to disturb the obsequies.”—Vol. i. pp. 381-384.

Although the domestic chaplain was treated with urbanity and kindness in the houses of men of liberal education it was otherwise under the roof of ordinary country gentlemen:—

“The coarse and ignorant squire, who thought it belonged to his dignity to have grace said every day at his table by an ecclesiastic in full canonicals, found means to reconcile dignity with economy. A young Levite—such was the phrase then in use—might be had for his board, a small garret, and ten pounds a year, and might not only perform his own professional functions, might not only be the most patient of butts and of listeners, might not only be always ready in fine weather for bowls, and in rainy weather for shovelboard, but might also save the expense of a gardener, or of a groom. Sometimes the reverend man nailed up the apricots, and sometimes he curried the coach-horses. He cast up the farrier's bills. He walked ten miles with a message or a parcel. If he was permitted to dine with the family he was expected to content himself with the plainest fare. He might fill himself with the corned beef and the carrots; but as soon as the tarts and cheesecakes made their appearance he quitted his seat, and stood aloof till he was summoned to return thanks for the repast, from a great part of which he had been excluded.”—Vol. i. p. 327.

When the chaplain was promoted to a living it was expected that he should take a wife. A waiting-woman in his patron's service was considered as a suitable match; and the chaplain was fortunate if the services of his helpmate had not been of an equivocal character. Nor was his position much improved by the change.

“Not one living in fifty enabled the incumbent to bring up a family comfortably. As children multiplied and grew, the household of the priest became more and more beggarly. Holes appeared more and more plainly in the thatch of his parsonage, and in his single cassock.

Often it was only by toiling on his glebe, by feeding swine, and by loading dung-carts, that he could obtain daily bread; nor did his utmost exertions always prevent the bailiffs from taking his Concordance and his inkstand in execution. It was a white day on which he was admitted into the kitchen of a great house, and regaled by the servants with cold meat and ale. His children were brought up like the children of the neighbouring peasantry. His boys followed the plough; and his girls went out to service. Study he found impossible: for the ad vowson of his living would hardly have sold for a sum sufficient to purchase a good theological library; and he might be considered as unusually lucky if he had ten or twelve dog-eared volumes among the pots and pans on his shelves."—Vol. i. p. 330.

When James II. quitted the bedside of the departed monarch, he commenced his reign by a speech to his Privy Councillors, then assembled in Whitehall. He expressed his resolution to maintain the established government in Church and State, to defend the Church of England, and support the just liberties of the people. How soon and how completely these pledges were broken, the events of his reign will show. Rochester became premier; and the other ministers of the late King were retained in office, more for the purpose of insulting than of honouring them. Though the Great Seal was left with Guildford, he was dishonoured by having associated with him, in the administration, the notorious Sir George Jeffreys, a man whose depravity has become proverbial.

"He was," says Mr. Macaulay, "a man of quick and vigorous parts, but constitutionally prone to insolence and to the angry passions. When just emerging from boyhood he had risen into practice at the Old Bailey bar, a bar where advocates have always used a license of tongue unknown in Westminster Hall. Here, during many years, his chief business was to examine and cross-examine the most hardened miscreants of a great capital. Daily conflicts with prostitutes and thieves called out and exercised his powers so effectually, that he became the most consummate bully ever known in his profession. All tenderness for the feelings of others, all self-respect, all sense of the becoming, were obliterated from his mind. He acquired a boundless command of the rhetoric in which the vulgar express hatred and contempt. The profusion of maledictions and vituperative epithets which composed his vocabulary, could hardly have been rivalled in the fish-market or the bear-garden. His countenance and his voice must always have been unamiable. But these natural advantages—for such he seems to have thought them—he had improved to such a degree that there were few who, in his paroxysms of rage, could see or hear him without emotion. Impudence and ferocity sate upon his brow. The glare of his eyes had a fascination for the unhappy victim on whom they were fixed. Yet his brow and eye were said to be less terrible than the savage lines of his mouth. His yell of fury, as was said by one who had

often heard it, sounded like the thunder of the judgment-day. * * * There was a fiendish exultation in the way in which he pronounced sentence on offenders. Their weeping and imploring seemed to titillate him voluptuously; and he loved to sear them into fits, by dilating, with luxuriant amplification, on all the details of what they were to suffer. Thus when he had an opportunity of ordering an unlucky adventuress to be whipped at the cart's tail,—‘Hangman,’ he would exclaim, ‘I charge you to pay particular attention to this lady. Scourge her soundly, man. Scourge her till the blood runs down! It is Christmas—a cold time for madam to strip in! See that you warm her shoulders thoroughly!’ * * *

“Even in civil causes his malevolent and despotic temper perpetually disordered his judgment. To enter his court was to enter the den of a wild beast which none could tame, and which was as likely to be roused to rage by caresses as by attacks. He frequently poured forth on plaintiffs and defendants, barristers and attorneys, witnesses and jurymen, torrents of frantic abuse, intermixed with oaths and curses. His looks and tones had inspired terror when he was merely a young advocate struggling into practice. Now that he was at the head of the most formidable tribunal in the realm, there were few indeed who did not tremble before him. Even when he was sober, his violence was sufficiently frightful. But in general his reason was overclouded and his evil passions stimulated by the fumes of intoxication. His evenings were ordinarily given to revelry. People who saw him only over his bottle would have supposed him to be a man gross indeed, sottish, and addicted to low company and low merriment, but social and good-humoured. He was constantly surrounded on such occasions by buffoons selected, for the most part, from among the vilest pettifoggers who practised before him. These men bantered and abused each other for his entertainment. He joined in their ribald talk, sang catches with them, and, when his head grew hot, hugged and kissed them in an ecstasy of drunken fondness. But, though wine at first seemed to soften his heart, the effect a few hours later was very different. He often came to the judgment-seat, having kept the court waiting long, and yet having but half slept off his debauch, his cheeks on fire, his eyes staring like those of a maniac. When he was in this state, his boon companions of the preceding night, if they were wise, kept out of his way; for the recollection of the familiarity to which he had admitted them inflamed his malignity; and he was sure to take every opportunity of overwhelming them with execration and invective. Not the least odious of his many odious peculiarities was the pleasure which he took in publicly browbeating and mortifying those whom, in his fits of maudlin tenderness, he had encouraged to presume on his favour.”—Vol. i. pp. 449-453.

A peerage, and a seat in the cabinet, was the retaining fee by which the King of England secured the services of the basest of his subjects. The advice to break the spirit and the letter of the law, by levying the customs for his own use, was the compensation which James received for the dignities of office. It had

become necessary to summon Parliament, but James knew that the King of France had employed both bribes and threats to prevent Charles from assembling the Houses, and was ready to become, like him, the hireling and the vassal of Louis. He therefore resisted the advice of his Council, but when his dread of the consequences had compelled him to yield, he thus addressed himself privately to the French ambassador:—"Assure your master of my gratitude and attachment; without his protection I can do nothing. If the Houses meddle with foreign affairs, I will send them about their business. He has a right to be consulted, and I wish to consult him about everything, but in this case a week's delay might have produced serious consequences." Next morning Rochester repeated these excuses to Barillon, and even asked for money. "It will be well laid out," he said, "your master cannot employ his revenues better." "The King of England should not be dependent upon his own people, but the friendship of France alone!" Thirty-five thousand five hundred pounds were remitted to Whitehall. The King received it with tears of joy, and the venal minister embraced the ambassador. The return for this bag of gold was the permission to annex Brabant and Hainault to France, and an ambassador extraordinary was selected to assure Louis of the gratitude and affection of the King. To discharge this duty, John Churchill, the germ of the infamous but illustrious Marlborough, was selected.

"Soon after the Restoration," says Mr. Macaulay, "James, young and ardent in the pursuit of pleasure, had been attracted by Arabella Churchill, one of the maids of honour who waited on his first wife. The young lady was not beautiful; but the taste of James was not nice; and she became his avowed mistress. She was the daughter of a poor Cavalier baronet, who haunted Whitehall, and made himself ridiculous by publishing a dull and affected folio, long forgotten, in praise of monarchy and monarchs. The necessities of the Churchills were pressing; their loyalty was ardent; and their only feeling about Arabella's seduction seems to have been joyful surprise that so plain a girl should have attained such high preferment.

"Her interest was indeed of great use to her relations; but none of them was so fortunate as her eldest brother John, a fine youth, who carried a pair of colours in the Foot Guards. He rose fast in the court and in the army, and was early distinguished as a man of fashion and of pleasure. His stature was commanding, his face handsome, his address singularly winning, yet of such dignity, that the most impertinent fops never ventured to take any liberty with him; his temper, even in the most vexatious and irritating circumstances, always under perfect command. His education had been so much neglected, that he could not spell the most common words of his own language; but his acute and vigorous understanding amply supplied the place of book learning. He was not loquacious; but, when he

was forced to speak in public, his natural eloquence moved the envy of practised rhetoricians. His courage was singularly cool and imperturbable. During many years of anxiety and peril, he never in any emergency lost, even for a moment, the perfect use of his admirable judgment.

"In his twenty-third year he was sent with his regiment to join the French forces, then engaged in operations against Holland. His serene intrepidity distinguished him among thousands of brave soldiers. His professional skill commanded the respect of veteran officers. He was publicly thanked at the head of the army, and received many marks of esteem and confidence from Turenne, who was then at the height of military glory.

"Unhappily the splendid qualities of John Churchill were mingled with alloy of the most sordid kind. Some propensities, which in youth are singularly ungraceful, began very early to shew themselves in him. He was thrifty in his very vices, and levied ample contributions on ladies enriched by the spoils of more liberal lovers. He was during a short time the object of the violent but fickle fondness of the Duchess of Cleveland. On one occasion he was caught with her by the King, and was forced to leap out of the window. She rewarded this hazardous feat of gallantry with a present of five thousand pounds. With this sum the prudent young hero instantly bought an annuity of four hundred a-year, well secured on landed property. Already his private drawers contained heaps of broad pieces, which, fifty years later, when he was a duke, a prince of the empire, and the richest subject in Europe, remained untouched.

"After the close of the war he was attached to the household of the Duke of York, accompanied his patron to the Low Countries and to Edinburgh, and was rewarded for his services with a Scotch peerage, and with the command of the only regiment of dragoons which was then on the English establishment. His wife had a post in the family of James's younger daughter, the Princess of Denmark." Vol. i. pp. 459-461.

After the ambassador had been a few weeks at Versailles, Barillon received £112,000, with instructions to furnish £30,000 to the Government, for the purpose of corrupting the members of the new House of Commons, and to "keep the rest in reserve for some extraordinary emergency, such as a dissolution or an insurrection!"

Thus faithless to the State, James soon became faithless to the Church. Roman Catholic rites were performed at Westminster, with regal splendour, and Protestant ceremonies were studiously omitted at his coronation. Blind to their master's character, the Tories were enthusiastic in his praise. Corporations and companies offered their adulation, and Oxford and Cambridge paraded their offensive loyalty. The electors, too, were so loyal that James did not require to put the French gold in circulation, and thus blessed with an obsequious Parliament, he began to

gloat over the pleasures of revenge. Oates* and Dangerfield were the first of the just objects of his wrath, and as if he had wished to shew to future ages how his avenging spirit could bestride the gulf which separates the extreme of vice from the extreme of virtue, he summoned Richard Baxter, the celebrated Non-conformist divine, to the court of King's Bench, on the same day on which Oates was pilloried in Palace Yard.

"He belonged," says Mr. Macaulay, "to the mildest and most temperate section of the Puritan body. He was a young man when the Civil War broke out. He thought that the right was on the side of the Houses; and he had no scruple about acting as chaplain to a regiment in the Parliamentary army; but his clear and somewhat sceptical understanding, and his strong sense of justice, preserved him from all excesses. He exerted himself to check the fanatical violence of the soldiery. He condemned the proceedings of the High Court of Justice. In the days of the Commonwealth he had the boldness to express, on many occasions, and once even in Cromwell's presence, love and reverence for the ancient institutions of the country. While the royal family was in exile, Baxter's life was chiefly passed at Kidderminster, in the assiduous discharge of parochial duties. He heartily concurred in the Restoration, and was sincerely desirous to bring about an union between Episcopalians and Presbyterians. For, with a liberality rare in his time, he considered questions of ecclesiastical polity as of small account when compared with the great principles of Christianity, and had never, even when prelacy was most odious to the ruling powers, joined in the outcry against bishops. The attempt to reconcile the contending factions failed. Baxter cast in his lot with his proscribed friends, refused the mitre of Hereford, quitted the parsonage of Kidderminster, and gave himself up almost wholly to study. His theological writings, though too moderate to be pleasing to the bigots of any party, had an immense reputation. Zealous churchmen called him a Roundhead; and many Non-conformists accused him of Erastianism and Arminianism. But the integrity of his heart, the purity of his life, the vigour of his faculties, and the extent of his attainments, were acknowledged by the best and wisest men of every persuasion."—Vol. i. pp. 491, 492.

LeStrange, the oracle of the clergy, raised the note of war against Baxter. An information was filed against him, and the illustrious chief of the Puritans, oppressed by age and infirmities, came to Westminster Hall to request time to prepare for his defence.

"Jeffreys burst into a storm of rage. 'Not a minute,' he cried, 'to save his life. I can deal with saints as well as with sinners. There stands Oates on one side of the pillory; and if Baxter stood

* Mr. Macaulay's description of the punishment and sufferings of Oates is so powerful and horrible, that we dare not transfer it to our pages. It may be read with safety after an inhalation of chloroform.

on the other, the two greatest rogues in the kingdom would stand together.' When the trial came on at Guilford, Pollexfen and Wallop appeared for the defendant. Pollexfen had scarce begun his address to the jury, when the Chief Justice broke forth: 'Pollexfen, I know you well. I will set a mark on you. You are the patron of the faction. This is an old rogue, a schismatical knave, a hypocritical villain. He hates the Liturgy. He would have nothing but long sounded cant without book,' and then his Lordship turned up his eyes, clasped his hands, and began to sing through his nose, in imitation of what he supposed to be Baxter's style of praying. 'Lord, we are thy people, thy peculiar people, thy dear people.' Pollexfen gently reminded the Court that his late Majesty had thought Baxter deserving of a bishopric. 'And what ailed the old blockhead then,' cried Jeffreys, 'that he did not take it?' His fury now rose almost to madness. He called Baxter a dog, and swore that it would be no more than justice to whip such a villain through the whole city * * * Wallop sate down; and Baxter himself attempted to put in a word. * * * 'My Lord,' said the old man, 'I have been much blamed by dissenters for speaking respectfully of bishops.'—'Baxter for bishops!' cried the judge, 'that's a merry conceit indeed. I know what you mean by bishops, rascals like yourselves, Kidderminster bishops, factious snivelling Presbyterians!' Again Baxter essayed to speak, and again Jeffreys bellowed, 'Richard, Richard, dost thou think we will let thee poison the Court? Richard, thou art an old knave! Thou hast written books enough to load a cart, and every book as full of sedition as an egg is full of meat. By the grace of God I'll look after thee. I see a great many of your brotherhood waiting to know what will befall their mighty Don. And then,' he continued, fixing his savage eyes on Baxter, 'there is a doctor of the party at your elbow. But, by the grace of God Almighty, I will crush you all!'—Vol. i. pp. 492, 493.

A fine of £500, with imprisonment till paid,* was the lenient punishment which the other three judges are supposed to have wrung from their savage chief, who is said to have proposed that the good man should be whipped through London at the cart's tail. Baxter went to prison, and remained there two years.

While these things were transacting in England, the infamous Claverhouse, with his bloodthirsty dragoons, was oppressing and murdering the Scottish Covenanters.

"The story ran," says Mr. Macaulay, "that these wretched men (the dragoons) used in their revels to play at the torments of hell, and to call each other by the names of devils and damned souls. The chief of this Tophet on earth, a soldier of distinguished courage and professional skill, but rapacious and profane, of violent temper, and of obdurate heart, has left a name which, wherever the Scottish race is settled on the face of the globe, is mentioned with a peculiar energy of hatred.

* See Nelson's *Puritan Directors*, Life of Baxter, p. xxiii., Lond. 1846, for a full account of this interesting trial.

To recapitulate all the crimes by which this man, and men like him, goaded the peasantry of the Western Lowlands into madness, would be an endless task. A few instances must suffice, and all these instances must be taken from the history of a single fortnight."—Vol. i. p. 498.

After giving an affecting and eloquent account of the sufferings of some of our noble martyrs to civil and religious liberty, Mr. Macaulay indignantly adds:—

"Thus was Scotland governed by that prince, whom ignorant men have represented as a friend of religious liberty, whose misfortune it was to be too wise and too good for the age in which he lived! * * * While his officers were committing the murders which have just been related, he was urging the Scottish Parliament to pass a new Act, compared with which all former Acts might be called merciful."—Vol. i. p. 502.

The affection of the King for William Penn, and his treatment of the Quakers, form a remarkable contrast with his conduct to Dissenters. Mr. Macaulay has given a very interesting account of the singular transactions which took place between Penn and the King, and candidly confesses that it requires some courage to speak the whole truth regarding this "mythical" personage. The Society of Friends, who worship him as an apostle, must either weep over his equivocal character, or fulminate their anathemas against the discriminating, and yet, perhaps, the too flattering delineation of him by Mr. Macaulay.*

The last chapter of Mr. Macaulay's first volume is occupied with the history of the rebellion in which the Earl of Argyle and the Duke of Monmouth fell a sacrifice to ill-judged, ill-concerted, and ill-executed schemes. Among the men whom the oppression of the Stuarts had driven from their native land, the Earl of Argyle and the Duke of Monmouth, who met the other refugees in Holland, were the most active and influential. Actuated by different motives, but impelled by the same hatred of their tyrant King, these bold men resolved to unfurl the standard of rebellion. Argyle was entrusted with the command in Scotland, subject however to the control of a committee, of which Sir Patrick Hume and Sir John Cochrane were the leaders. Argyle's force of 1800 men assembled in the isthmus of Tarbet; but the Government, who had received early intelligence of his intention, had collected the clans that were hostile to him, and sent ships of war to cruise in the Frith of Clyde. The committee thwarted him in all his plans. The provisions were insufficient for the wants of the troops. The Highlanders

* If our author wishes to retain the favour of our good friends, we would recommend him to "mend his Penn" for another edition of his work,

deserted in hundreds, and Argyle, in place of taking a position among his native mountains, was compelled, by the rash counsel of his friends, to carry the war into the Lowlands. Disaster followed disaster, till his troops and their leaders were obliged to seek for safety in flight. Argyle himself was made captive in the disguise of a peasant, and was ordered for execution, not on account of his share in the rebellion, but under the sentence which had been previously pronounced against him for refusing to sign the Test Act.

This noble victim of arbitrary power exhibited, in his hour of suffering, that courage and peace of mind which faith and hope could alone inspire. His cause, he said, was that of God, and must be triumphant. "I do not," he added, "take upon myself to be a prophet, but I have a strong impression on my spirit *that deliverance will come very suddenly.*" After his last meal, which he had taken with appetite, he lay down as he was wont to do, in order that he might be in full vigour to mount the scaffold.

"At this time, one of the Lords of the Council, who had probably been bred a Presbyterian, and had been seduced by interest to join in oppressing the Church of which he had once been a member, came to the Castle with a message from his brethren, and demanded admittance to the Earl. It was answered, that the Earl was asleep. The Privy Councillor thought that this was a subterfuge, and insisted on entering. The door of the cell was softly opened, and there lay Argyle on the bed, sleeping in his irons the placid sleep of infancy. The conscience of the *renegade* smote him. He turned away sick at heart, ran out of the Castle, and took refuge in the dwelling of a lady of his family who lived hard by. There he flung himself on a couch, and gave himself up to an agony of remorse and shame. His kinswoman, alarmed by his looks and groans, thought that he had been taken with sudden illness, and begged him to drink a cup of sack. 'No, no,' he said, 'that will do me no good.' She prayed him to tell her what had disturbed him. 'I have been,' he said, 'in Argyle's prison. I have seen him within an hour of eternity, sleeping as sweetly as ever man did. But as for me, ——' When Argyle was brought to the Council-house, he was allowed pen and ink to write thus to his wife :—'Dear heart, God is unchangeable. He hath always been good and gracious to me, and no place alters it. Forgive me all my faults, and now comfort thyself in Him in whom only true comfort is to be found. The Lord be with thee, bless and comfort thee, my dearest. Adieu.' When mounted on the scaffold, one of the Episcopal clergymen in attendance called out loudly—'My Lord dies a Protestant.' 'Yes,' added the Earl, stepping forward, 'and not only a Protestant, but with a heart-hatred of Popery, of Prelacy, and of all superstition.' Having embraced his friends, he knelt down, laid his head on the block of the *Maiden*, and gave the signal to the executioner."—Vol. i. pp. 563, 565.

Before the termination of this unfortunate rebellion, Monmouth, with a stronger force, landed in the port of Lynn in 1680, having escaped the vessels of the enemy that were lying in wait for him, as well as the disasters that threatened him at sea. No sooner had he landed than he issued a manifesto full of falsehood and violence, denouncing James as a murderer and usurper, and declaring that he himself was legitimate, and King of England by right of blood. Recruits flocked to his standard, and after some skirmishes with the Royal troops under the Duke of Albemarle, he entered Taunton, where he foolishly allowed himself to be proclaimed king on the 20th of June. On the 5th of July the Royal army pitched their tents on the plain of Sedgemoor, about three miles from Bridgewater. After surveying their position from the lofty steeple of Bridgewater Church, Monmouth resolved upon a night attack, but upon bringing his forces up to their position, he was startled at the discovery that a deep trench lay between him and the camp which he expected to surprise. He halted, and fired on the Royal infantry on the opposite bank. The battle raged for three quarters of an hour, but the other divisions of the Royal army having come up, the cavalry of the insurgents under Grey were panic-struck, and the advantage which darkness and surprise had given to the assailants was soon lost, and Monmouth himself retreated and rode from the field, leaving more than a thousand of his men lying dead on the moor. The loss of the King's army was only 300 in killed and wounded. Monmouth was taken prisoner in the New Forest, and was conveyed to Ringwood under a strong guard.

Though brave in the field the courage of Monmouth failed him in the solitude of a prison. He begged his life from the King, with a craven spirit unworthy of his name and his lineage. He implored and obtained an interview with the King. He crawled to his uncle's feet, embraced his knees with his pinioned arms, and with tears in his eyes he confessed his crime, and endeavoured to find some apology for it by throwing the blame on the noble Argyle. He would have renounced his religion for his life, but James was inexorable, and the day of his execution was fixed. The Duchess of Monmouth, with her children, visited him in prison, but he received them and parted with them without emotion. His heart had strayed from its first love, and had squandered its deepest affections upon Lady Wentworth, by means of whose wealth he had been enabled to fit out his hapless expedition. The circumstances connected with his execution are too painful to be minutely detailed. The fatal axe placed in a faltering hand refused to do its work, and Monmouth perished with difficulty amid the suppressed sympathies of

Monmouth's Execution and Burial—Butcheries in t

thousands, and the deepest execrations of the mob, an unskilful executioner. The head and body, placed were buried privately under the communion-table of St. Chapel in the Tower. Beneath the same pavement, at Monmouth's remains, were laid within four years the remains of Jeffreys.

"In truth," says Mr. Macaulay, "there is no sadder spot on the earth than that little cemetery. Death is not there consecrated as in Westminster Abbey and St. Paul's, with genius and virtue, with public veneration, and with imperishable renown, not as in our humblest churches and church-yards, with everything that is most endearing in social and domestic charities; but with whatever is darkest in human nature and in human destiny, with the savage triumph of implacable enemies, with the inconstancy, the ingratitude, the cowardice of friends, with all the miseries of fallen greatness and of blighted fame. Thither have been carried through successive ages, by the rude hands of gaolers, without one mourner following, the bleeding relics of men who had been the captains of armies, the leaders of parties, the oracles of senates, and the ornaments of Courts. Thither was borne before the window where Jane Grey was praying, the mangled corpse of Guilford Dudley. Edward Seymour, Duke of Somerset and Protector of the Realm, reposes there beside the brother whom he murdered. There has mouldered away the headless trunk of John Fisher Bishop of Rochester and Cardinal of St. Vitalis, a man worthy to have lived in a better age and to have died in a better cause. There are laid John Dudley, Duke of Northumberland, Lord High Admiral, and Thomas Cromwell Earl of Essex, Lord High Treasurer. There, too, is another Essex, on whom nature and fortune had lavished all their bounties in vain, and whom valour, grace, genius, Royal favour and popular applause, conducted to an early and ignominious doom. Not far off sleep two chiefs of the great house of Howard, Thomas, fourth Duke of Norfolk, and Philip, eleventh Earl of Arundel. Here and there among the thick graves of unquiet and aspiring statesmen, lie more delicate sufferers; Margaret of Salisbury, the last of the proud name of Plantagenet, and those two fair Queens, who perished by the jealous rage of Henry. Such was the dust with which the dust of Monmouth mingled."—Vol. i. pp. 628, 629.

The week which followed the battle of Sedgemoor was marked in the annals of the West with cruelties that disgrace the reign and the age in which they were committed. A ferocious colonel of the name of Kirke, butchered an hundred captives, without even the form of trial. The rich purchased their lives for thirty or forty pounds, while the poor captives were executed amid the mockery and carousals of a brutal soldiery. The sign-post of the White Hart Inn of Taunton served for a gallows, and on the spot where the bodies were quartered,

"the executioner stood ankle deep in blood." Military execution was speedily followed by civil murder, wearing the mask of law. A ferocious judge, more brutal still than the brutal soldier, stimulated by a King as brutal as himself, stalked in ermine through the West, with the stake and the gallows in his train, to complete the desolation of an already desolate land. Jeffreys presided at the bloody assize, and reaped his harvest of seventy-four lives in Dorsetshire, and two hundred and thirty-three in Somersetshire. The history and fate of the most interesting of the unhappy victims has been beautifully related by Mr. Macaulay. We can only notice the story of Lady Alice Lisle, the widow of John Lisle, who had been raised to the peerage by Cromwell, and who was assassinated by three Irish ruffians at Lausanne. She had given food and a resting-place to two outlaws, John Hickes, a non-conformist divine, and Richard Nelthorpe, a lawyer, who had been concerned in the Rye-house Plot. By browbeating the witnesses, and threatening the jury, the judicial hyæna obtained a verdict against female humanity, that noble quality which even uncivilized woman has a prescriptive right to exercise. Her sentence, to be burnt alive on the same day, was commuted to beheading, and she met her fate heroically in the market-place of Winchester.

But neither the Hyæna Judge, nor his congener the Royal Tiger, were satisfied with blood. Even the carnivorous appetite delights in a change of food. The goblet of red wine may derive some zest even from the cup of fetid water; and when the axe is too sharp to give pain, and the hempen coil too quick to kill, torture may be prolonged by the scourge, and agony made ductile by imprisonment and exile. In these varieties of revenge the bloodthirsty Court wantonly indulged. Several of the rebels were sentenced to scourging not less terrible than that which Oates had undergone, and women who had merely spoken some idle words, were condemned to be whipped through all the market-towns in Dorsetshire. A youth, named Tulchen, was condemned to be imprisoned for seven years, and to be flogged every year through every town in the county. Upwards of 840 prisoners were ordered to be transported as slaves for ten years to some West India Island. One-fifth of these wretched exiles perished on the voyage, and so narrow was the space in which the living were confined, that there was not space for them to lie down. The men who survived these calamities were reduced by starvation to the state of skeletons, and the persons to whom they were consigned were obliged to fatten them previous to their sale. In many cases life was spared not from mercy but from avarice. Jeffreys accumulated a fortune from the ransom money for which he bartered the lives of the higher class of

Whigs;* and the parasites who assisted him were allowed to appropriate to themselves the price of pardons. Nor was this variety of life insurance confined to Jeffreys and his minions. The name of the Queen, of Mary of Modena, however honoured it may be by fortitude in adversity, has received a stain which no stoical virtues can efface. The ladies of her household, encouraged not only by her approbation but by her example, did not scruple to wring money out of the parents of the young women who had walked in the procession which presented the standard to Monmouth at Taunton. When Sir F. Warre refused to assist in this ignoble extortion, William Penn accepted and executed the commission! The Queen had never saved or tried to save the life of a single victim of her husband's cruelty. "The only request," says Mr. Macaulay, "which she is known to have preferred, touching the rebels, was that 100 of those who were sentenced to transportation might be given to her! The profit which she cleared on the cargo, after making large allowance for those who died of hunger and fever during the passage, cannot be estimated at less than a thousand

When Jeffreys returned from his Western campaign, as the King styled it, leaving the country strewed with the heads and limbs of the rebels, a peerage and the Great Seal of England were his rewards. Another campaign in the city of London was arranged and carried out. The rich Whig merchants proved a noble quarry for the Royal Sportsman and his Gamekeeper. To them the gold in their purse was of more value than the flesh on their bones, and it was possible, too, that the double prey might be secured. The aggressions against the wealthy traders, however, were not equal in atrocity to the execution of Elizabeth Gaunt, an old Anabaptist lady, who was distinguished by her acts of benevolence to the needy of all denominations. A wretch of the name of Burton, one of the Rye-house plotters, had received money and assistance from this lady, to enable him to save his life by escaping to Holland. He returned with Monmouth, and fought at Sedgemoor, and when pursued by the Government, who had offered £100 for his apprehension, he obtained shelter in the house of one John Fernley, a barber. This honest man, though besieged by creditors, was faithful to the stranger under his roof. Burton, however, surrendered himself, and saved his life by giving information, and appearing as the principal witness, against his two benefactors. They were both tried and both convicted. Fernley perished by the gallows, and Elizabeth Gaunt was burned alive at Tyburn. At her dying hour she forgave her enemies,

Edmund Prideaux paid the Chief Justice £15,000 for his liberation.

leaving them "to the judgment of the King of kings." During this the foulest of judicial murders, an awful tempest broke forth—destroying ships and dwellings, as if Heaven were lifting its voice and its arm against the workers of iniquity.*

Towards the close of 1685, James had reached the climax of his prosperity and power, that giddy height to which Providence raises tyrants in order to magnify their fall. It is when the meteor shoots from the zenith that we can best contrast the brightness of its flash with the rapidity of its descent, and the extinction of its splendour. The Whigs were shorn of their power. The clergy were the King's worshippers—the corporations his creatures, and the judges his tools. He meditated the repeal of the Habeas Corpus and Test Acts, and the formation of a standing army; and forgetting that he had been the pensioner and vassal of Louis, he was willing to place himself at the head of a confederacy which should limit the too formidable power of France. In all these schemes James was doomed to disappointment. The Habeas Corpus Act was as dear to the Tories as to the Whigs who passed it. A standing army, associated with the events of the Protectorship, and incompatible with the militia force, which was officered by the gentry, was highly unpopular, and the admission of Catholics to civil and military office was equally adverse to the feelings and the principles of the whole Protestant community. Roman Catholic divines had argued in their writings in favour of equivocation, mental reservation, perjury, and even assassination; and Catholics of acknowledged piety did not scruple to defend the massacre of St. Bartholomew and the Gunpowder Plot. Popery was therefore justly dreaded by every friend of Protestantism. Nor was this dread confined to the populace and to the intolerant among the clergy. Tillotson warned the House of Commons "against the propagation of a religion more mischievous than irreligion itself;" and declared that the idolatrous Pagans were better members of civil society than men who had imbibed the principles of the Popish casuists; while Locke contended that the Church which taught that faith should not be kept with heretics, had no claim to toleration. In place of removing these feelings by moderate and constitutional proceedings, James gave them a new and irresistible force by the most illegal exertions of his power. In opposition to law, many Roman Catholics held commissions in the army, and he was determined to increase their number. Halifax, though unsupported by his colleagues, was bold enough to express in the Cabinet his disgust and alarm; and the King, after trying in vain to corrupt him,

* "Since that terrible day," says Mr. Macaulay, "no woman has suffered death in England for any political offence."

dismissed him from his service. A section of the Tories was animated with the same feelings as the Whigs. Even the Bishops expressed the sentiment, that there were principles higher than loyalty; and the very chiefs of the army gave utterance to their dissatisfaction. The obsequious Churchill ventured to insinuate that the King was going too far, and the bloodthirsty Kirke, who had pledged his word to the Emperor of Morocco that if he changed his religion at all he would become a Mussulman, swore that he would stand by the Protestant faith.

These feelings were greatly strengthened by the persecution of the Huguenots in France, and the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Massacres and executions had preceded this arbitrary act, and cruelties unheard of followed in its train. Fifty thousand of the best French families quitted the kingdom for ever, carrying with them to foreign lands their skill in science and literature, in arts, and in arms. These events, which became known immediately before the meeting of Parliament in November 1685, foreshadowed to the English mind the consequences of a standing army officered by Roman Catholics. James applied to the Commons for a large supply to increase the regular army; and he intimated to them his resolution not to part with the Roman Catholic officers whom he had illegally employed. The House voted the Supply for making the militia more efficient, which was equivalent to a declaration against a standing army; and they agreed to an Address reminding the King that he could not legally employ officers who had not taken the statutory test. To this Address the King returned a cold and sullen reprimand; and when it was proposed that his Majesty's answer should be taken into consideration by the House, John Coke in seconding the motion said, "I hope that we are all Englishmen, and shall not be frightened by a few high words." The words were taken down, and Coke was sent to the Tower. The spirit of opposition spread to the Lords, and even to the Episcopal bench. The Earl of Devonshire and Viscount Halifax boldly took the lead, and Dr. Compton, Bishop of London, a prelate of noble blood, declared in the name of his brethren, that the Constitution of the realm, civil and ecclesiastical, was in danger. An early day was fixed for considering the King's speech, but James dreading the result, came down next morning and prorogued the Parliament, dismissing from office all who had voted against the Court.

These violent proceedings created alarm even in the minds of his Ministers. They had seen how highly the gentry of England valued the Established religion, and were anxious that discreet and moderate counsels should prevail. A knot of Roman Catholics of broken fortune and licentious character, however, headed by the Earls of Castlemaine and Tyrconnel, opposed

themselves to the Protestant policy of England, and were impatient to fill the highest offices of the State. The Court was thus divided into two hostile factions—the Protestant Ministers supported by the most respectable Catholic nobles and gentlemen, the ambassadors of Spain, Austria, and the States General, and even by the Pontiff himself; and the violent Catholics, supported by the French King and the whole influence of the mighty order of Jesus.

Mr. Macaulay has drawn a powerful picture of the virtues and vices of the Jesuits. We enumerate their merits when we mention their eloquence in the pulpit, their genius in science, their acquirements in literature, and their powers of instruction. We enumerate their virtues when we admit their heroism in deeds of mercy, and their self-devotion in missionary labour. Their vices are thus embalmed in Mr. Macaulay's eloquence.*

“ But with the admirable energy, disinterestedness, and self-devotion, which were characteristic of the society, great vices were mingled. It was alleged, and not without foundation, that the ardent public spirit which made the Jesuit regardless of his ease, of his liberty, and of his life, made him also regardless of truth and of mercy; that no means which could promote the interest of his religion seemed to him unlawful; and that by the interest of his religion he too often meant the interest of his society. It was alleged that, in the most atrocious plots recorded in history, his agency could be distinctly traced; that, constant only in attachment to the fraternity to which he belonged, he was in some countries the most dangerous enemy of freedom, and in others the most dangerous enemy of order. The mighty victories which he boasted that he had achieved in the cause of the Church were, in the judgment of many illustrious members of that Church, rather apparent than real. He had, indeed, laboured with a wonderful show of success to reduce the world under her laws; but he had done so by relaxing her laws to suit the temper of the world. Instead of toiling to elevate human nature to the noble standard fixed by divine precept and example, he had lowered the standard till it was beneath the average level of human nature. He gloried in multitudes of converts who had been baptized in the remote regions of the East; but it was reported that from some of those converts the facts on which the whole theology of the Gospel depends had been cunningly concealed, and that others were permitted to avoid persecution, by bowing down before the images of false gods, while internally repeating *Paters* and *Aves*. Nor was it only in heathen countries that such arts were said to be practised. It was not strange that people of all ranks, and especially of the highest ranks, crowded to the Confessionals in the Jesuit temples; for from those Confessionals none went discontented away. There the priest

* See our review of *Pascal's Writings*, vol. i. pp. 313-316, for an earlier account of the Jesuits, by a Roman Catholic.

was all things to all men. He showed just so much rigour as might not drive those who knelt at his spiritual tribunal to the Dominican or the Franciscan church. If he had to deal with a mind truly devout, he spoke in the saintly tones of the primitive fathers; but with that very large part of mankind who have religion enough to make them uneasy when they do wrong, and not religion enough to keep them from doing wrong, he followed a very different system. Since he could not reclaim them from guilt, it was his business to save them from remorse. He had at his command an immense dispensary of anodynes for wounded consciences. In the books of casuistry which had been written by his brethren, and printed with the approbation of his superiors, were to be found doctrines consolatory to transgressors of every class. There the bankrupt was taught how he might without sin secrete his goods from his creditors. The servant was taught how he might, without sin, run off with his master's plate. The pander was assured that a Christian man might innocently earn his living by carrying letters and messages between married women and their gallants. The high-spirited and punctilious gentlemen of France were gratified by a decision in favour of duelling. The Italians, accustomed to darker and baser modes of vengeance, were glad to learn that they might, without any crime, shoot at their enemies from behind hedges. To deceit was given a license sufficient to destroy the whole value of human contracts and of human testimony. In truth, if society continued to hold together, if life and property enjoyed any security, it was because common sense and common humanity restrained man from doing what the Society of Jesus assured them that they might with a safe conscience do."—Vol. ii. pp. 56-58.

That James would yield to the counsels of the Jesuitical cabal must have been foreseen even by their enemies. He laboured under two delusions, the one that he should make no concessions, because his father who made concessions was beheaded; and the other, that the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance should be the practice, because it was the theory, of the Anglican Church and its lay supporters. The Protestant members of the Cabinet, with the exception of Sunderland, who had been converted to Popery, and joined the Jesuits, made the dangerous attempt to govern James by means of a concubine. The lady who was supposed to possess so potent an influence over the King, and whom he created Duchess of Dorset, was Catherine Sedley; but though she exercised a complete control over the royal will, she failed in the object which she was expected to accomplish.

The King had now determined upon a line of policy which he knew would be opposed by his Parliament. He resolved to have his dispensing power conjoined with his ecclesiastical supremacy, that he might by the one admit Catholics to civil, military, and even spiritual offices, and by the other make the English clergy the instruments for destroying their own religion.

The Court of King's Bench decided in favour of the dispensing power, and four Roman Catholics were speedily sworn of the Privy Council. Protestant clergymen, who had become Catholics, were allowed to retain their livings, and a Papist was made Dean of Christchurch College, Oxford, within whose walls mass was daily celebrated. Not content with these violations of law, the King placed the whole government of the Church in the hands of six commissioners, viz., three prelates and three laymen, and having the same seal as the Old High Commission. Convents sprung up in the city; cowls appeared in the streets; and in order to keep down the general discontent, and overawe the metropolis, a camp of 13,000 was formed on Hounslow Heath.

Similar attempts were made in Scotland in favour of the Roman Catholics, but, after a noble struggle, the Lords of Articles, the tools of the King, were contented with the proposal that Roman Catholics should not incur any penalty by worshipping God in private houses, and even this the Scottish Estates would only pass with great restrictions and modifications. Ireland was governed on the same tyrannical principles. Roman Catholics were admitted to office, and the object of the King, and of his infamous deputy Tyreconnel, was to destroy or drive from the island the whole English population. These violent measures were crowned by the dismissal of the two Hydes, the brothers-in-law of the King, his steady adherents in adversity, and his obsequious servants in power. Their sole crime was their religion. "The cry now was," says Mr. Macaulay, "that a general proscription was at hand, and that every public functionary must make up his mind to lose his soul or to lose his place." Men looked round for help, and a deliverer was at hand. William Henry Prince of Orange was destined to vindicate the liberties and wield the sceptre of England. The merit of this great man has never been appreciated as it ought by the people whom he delivered. It has fallen to the lot of Mr. Macaulay to do justice to his memory, by a minute and powerful delineation of his character. Occupying very many pages, and incapable of abridgment, we must refer our readers to the work itself, and content ourselves with the following fragment:—

"He was born with violent passions and quick sensibilities; but the strength of his conviction was not suspected by the world. From the multitude his joy and his grief, his affection and his resentment, were hidden by a phlegmatic serenity, which made him pass for the most cold-blooded of mankind. Those who brought him good news could seldom detect any sign of pleasure. Those who saw him after a defeat looked in vain for any trace of vexation. He praised and reprimanded, rewarded and punished, with the stern tranquillity of a Mohawk chief: But those who knew him well, and saw him near, were

aware that under all this ice a fierce fire was constantly burning. It was seldom that anger deprived him of power over himself. But when he was really enraged, the first outbreak of his passion was terrible. It was indeed scarcely safe to approach him. On these rare occasions, however, as soon as he regained his self-command, he made such ample reparation to those whom he had wronged, as tempted them to wish that he would go into a fury again. His affection was as impetuous as his wrath. Where he loved, he loved with the whole energy of his strong mind. When death separated him from what he loved, the few who witnessed his agonies trembled for his reason and his life. To a very small circle of intimate friends, on whose fidelity and secrecy he could absolutely depend, he was a different man from the reserved and stoical William, whom the multitude supposed to be destitute of human feelings. He was kind, candid, open, even convivial and jocose, would sit at table many hours, and would bear his full share in festive conversation."—Vol. ii. p. 170.

In his political character William was neither a Whig nor a Tory. "He wanted," says Mr. Macaulay, "that which is the common groundwork of both characters; for he never became an Englishman. He saved England, it is true, but he never loved her, and he never obtained her love. To him she was always a land of exile, visited with reluctance, and quitted with delight." It was not for her welfare that he fought. Whatever patriotic feeling he possessed was for Holland, and the moving spring of all his actions was his attachment to the Protestant faith, and the deepest hostility to France and her ambitious and persecuting king. Under the influence of these views, William was the prime though concealed mover in those arrangements for mutual defence, which were embodied in the treaty of Augsburg.* The power of England was alone wanting to give energy to this powerful confederacy; and to obtain her concurrence, he placed himself at the head of the Protestant opposition, which, after the fall of the Hydes, had increased in numbers and in strength. At this time apostasy was the road to power. The Earls of Peterborough and Salisbury were converted to Popery, and John Dryden, the poet who "had led a life of mendicancy and adulation," bartered his conscience for a pension of £100 a-year, and prostituted his already licentious pen in defending both in prose and in verse the new faith which he embraced. Mr. Macaulay notices the remarkable fact, that in Dryden's political poem of the Hind and Panther, the Church of England, at first mentioned with respect, is exhorted to ally itself with the Papists against the Puritans, but at the close of the poem, and in the

* Signed in July 1686, by the Princes of the Empire and the Kings of Spain and Sweden.

preface written after the poem was finished, the Protestant dissenters are invited to make common cause with the Papists against the Church of England. This was the foreshadow of James's policy. His enmity to the Puritans disappeared in his hatred of the English Church, and on the 4th April 1687, appeared the unconstitutional Declaration of Indulgence, which gave entire liberty of conscience to all his subjects. He abrogated a long series of oppressive statutes, and authorized Roman Catholics and Protestant dissenters to celebrate their religious rites in public. The hitherto persecuted Puritan could not but rejoice in the repeal of acts under which he had been so long oppressed, while the Anglican Church stood petrified with terror. "Her chastisement was just, she reaped that which she had sown." She had ever urged the Stuarts against the Presbyterians. In her distress she now sought their friendship, and thus did the Protestant dissenters hold the balance of power between the King and the Church, who were bidding eagerly for their favour. James declared that he had persecuted the Dissenters in order to please the Church, and the Church retorted that they had aided in the persecution in order to please the King. Those who were lately schismatics and fanatics, were now "dear fellow Protestants," and it was even held out to them by Churchmen, that they might sit on the Episcopal bench.

At this singular crisis, "The Letter of a Dissenter," a masterly tract, believed to be written by Halifax, was circulated in thousands throughout the kingdom. It urged the Non-conformists to prefer an alliance with the Church to an alliance with the King; and such was its force of argument, that the great body of Dissenters, including Baxter, and Howe, and Bunyan, declared themselves hostile to the dispensing power, and took part with the Established Church. William of Orange and the Princess Mary entertained the same views, and conveyed them respectfully to the King. Under such a leader the opposition waxed daily in power. Dykevelt, the Dutch ambassador in name, was in reality an envoy to the opposition. The Earls of Danby and Nottingham, and Halifax, the chief of the Trimmers, were in constant communication with Dykevelt. Through Bishop Compton he looked for the support of the clergy, through Admiral Herbert for that of the navy, and Churchill, foreseeing that nobody would be safe who would not become a Roman Catholic, was the instrument by which the army was to be secured. This aid was in another respect most desirable. It was important that the Princess Anne should act in union with her sister, and this could only be brought about by the agency of Churchill's wife, who absolutely governed her, and

who, as the Duchess of Marlborough, played such an important part in the future history of Europe.

“The name of this celebrated favourite was Sarah Jennings. Her elder sister, Frances, had been distinguished by beauty and levity even among the crowd of beautiful faces and light characters which adorned and disgraced Whitehall during the wild carnival of the Restoration. On one occasion, Frances dressed herself like an orange girl, and cried fruit about the streets. Sober people predicted that a girl of so little discretion and delicacy would not easily find a husband. She was however twice married, and was now the wife of Tyrconnel. Sarah, less regularly beautiful, was perhaps more attractive. Her face was expressive; her form wanted no feminine charm; and the profusion of her fine hair, not yet disguised by powder according to that barbarous fashion which she lived to see introduced, was the delight of numerous admirers. Among the gallants who sued for her favour, Colonel Churchill, young, handsome, graceful, insinuating, eloquent and brave, obtained the preference. He must have been enamoured indeed. For he had little property except the annuity which he had bought with the infamous wages bestowed on him by the Duchess of Cleveland; he was insatiable of riches. Sarah was poor; and a plain girl with a large fortune was proposed to him. His love, after a struggle, prevailed over his avarice; marriage only strengthened his passion; and, to the last hour of his life, Sarah enjoyed the pleasure and distinction of being the one human being who was able to mislead that far-sighted and sure-footed judgment, who was fervently loved by that cold heart, and who was servilely feared by that intrepid spirit.

“In a worldly sense the fidelity of Churchill’s love was amply rewarded. His bride, though slenderly portioned, brought with her a dowry which, judiciously employed, made him at length a Duke of England, a sovereign prince of the empire, the captain-general of a great coalition, the arbiter between mighty princes, and what he valued more, the wealthiest subject in Europe. She had been brought up from childhood with the Princess Anne; and a close friendship had arisen between the girls. In character they resembled each other very little. Anne was slow and taciturn. To those whom she loved she was meek. The form which her anger assumed was sullenness. She had a strong sense of religion, and was attached even with bigotry to the rites and government of the Church of England. Sarah was lively and voluble, domineered over those whom she regarded with most kindness, and when she was offended, vented her rage in tears and tempestuous reproaches. To sanctity she made no pretence, and, indeed, narrowly escaped the imputation of irreligion. She was not yet what she became when one class of vices had been fully developed in her by prosperity, and another by adversity, when her brain had been turned by success and flattery, when her heart had been ulcerated by disasters and mortifications. She lived to be that most odious and miserable of human beings, an ancient crone at war with her whole kind, at war with her own children and grandchildren, great

indeed and rich, but valuing greatness and riches chiefly because they enabled her to brave public opinion and to indulge without restraint her hatred to the living and the dead. In the reign of James she was regarded as nothing worse than a fine high-spirited young woman, who could now and then be cross and arbitrary, but whose flaws of temper might well be pardoned in consideration of her charms."—Vol. ii. pp. 256-258.

Notwithstanding these differences in disposition and temper, Lady Churchill was loved and even worshipped by Anne, who could not live apart from the object of her affection. If filial duty had disposed the Princess to take part with her father, her regard for the Protestant faith, and the influence of the Churchills, could not fail to decide the question, and she accordingly joined the party which was destined to drive her father from his throne.

Early in the year 1687, the infatuation of the King was singularly displayed in his mad attempt to insult and plunder the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge—corporations which had ever been distinguished by their loyalty as well as by their liberality to the Crown. In February 1687, the King sent a royal letter to Cambridge, directing the University to admit to the degree of Master of Arts an ignorant Benedictine monk of the name of Alban Francis. This degree had been conferred as an *honorary* one on ambassadors of foreign princes, and even on the secretary of the ambassador from Morocco, but never on persons in the situation of Francis. It was offered, however, to Francis provided he took the necessary oaths, but he refused; and having carried his complaint to Whitehall, the vice-chancellor and the Senate were summoned before the new High Commission. The vice-chancellor, Dr. John Peachell, accompanied by Sir Isaac Newton and other seven deputies, appeared before the Commission. Though the case was clear, it was ill pleaded by the weak and timid vice-chancellor, and when any of the deputies, perhaps Newton himself, attempted to supply the defect of their chief, Jeffreys, who occupied the chair, ordered them to hold their peace, and "thrust them out of the Court without a hearing." Upon being called in again, Jeffreys announced that Peachell was deprived of his vice-chancellorship, and suspended from all his emoluments as Master of a College. "As to you," said Jeffreys to Sir Isaac Newton and the other delegates, "most of you are divines. I will therefore send you home with a text of Scripture,—'Go your way, and sin no more, lest a worse thing befall you.'" The University chose another vice-chancellor, who pledged himself that neither religion nor the rights of the body should suffer by his means; and the King, awed no doubt by this pledge, was obliged to abandon his designs.

The attack upon the privileges of Oxford was more serious still. The stubborn tyrant had resolved to transfer to Papists the wealthiest and noblest foundations, and he began with the presidency of Magdalen College which had just become vacant. A royal letter was despatched, recommending one Anthony Farmer, once a dissenter, now a papist,—a wretch whose scandalous and profligate life unfitted him for any situation, and whose youth, had he been spotless, disqualified him for the charge of a college. Hoping that the King would be moved by the remonstrances addressed to him, the College delayed the election till the very latest hour. When the day arrived, the electors took the sacrament, and elected John Hough, chaplain to the Duke of Ormond, then Chancellor of the University, and a man of eminent virtue and prudence. The Commission, headed by Jeffreys, summoned the refractory Fellows to Whitehall, loaded them with abuse, and pronounced Hough's election void. Another royal letter arrived, recommending Parker, Bishop of Oxford, who was not a papist. The College refused to comply, and peace for a while reigned within its walls.

In the autumn of 1687, James set out upon a long progress to the south and west of his kingdom. When he reached Oxford, he summoned the Fellows of Magdalen to his presence. They tendered a petition on their knees. He refused to look at it, exclaiming, "Get you gone. I am King. I will be obeyed. Go to your chapel this instant, and admit the Bishop of Oxford." Mortified by their refusal, he tried the agency of Penn, the ever ready tool of the tyrant; but the Quaker failed in his attempts to intimidate or cajole them. A visitatorial Commission was then appointed, headed by Cartwright Bishop of Chester, and flanked by three troops of dragoons with drawn swords. They entered the hall of Magdalen, ejected Hough, inducted Parker, and expelled the recreant Fellows, pronouncing them incapable of holding church preferment, or of receiving holy orders. Thus did this noble institution become a Popish seminary, presided over by a Roman Catholic bishop after Parker's death, and harbouring a brood of Roman Catholic Fellows in its sacred cloisters, and among its verdant bowers.

A scheme was about this time in agitation to set aside the Princess Mary as successor to the Crown, and prefer the Princess Anne, provided she turned Catholic; and James had even begun to listen to suggestions for excluding both from the succession. An event, however, occurred, which put an end to these speculations. The Queen was reported to be with child. The Virgin of Loretto was supposed to have granted this boon to the supplications of the Duchess of Modena, and St. Winifred to James himself, when he implored it during his visit to the Holy Well.

The Popish zealots predicted that the unborn child would be a boy, and one fanatic foresaw a couple of them, one of whom was to be King of England, and the other Pope of Rome! One party rejoiced, and the other sneered. The poets hailed the new marvel in rhymes, and the country squires with roars of laughter. A suitable thanksgiving was offered from the pulpit, but the people were not thankful, and the congregations made no reverential responses.

Determined to obtain for his contemplated measures the sanction of Parliament, James proceeded with energy and method to obtain one to his mind. The Lords Lieutenants of counties were ordered to their posts to take steps for influencing the elections; but half of them refused, and were dismissed from their office, and among these were the Earls of Oxford, of Shrewsbury, and of Dorset. Mr. Macaulay has drawn with a fine pencil the characters of these three noblemen. We cannot resist the temptation to give that of Charles Sackville, Earl of Dorset:—

“ In his youth he had been one of the most notorious libertines of the wild time which followed the Restoration. He had been the terror of the city watch, had passed many nights in the round house, and had at least once occupied a cell in Newgate. His passion for Betty Morrice and for Nell Gwynn, who always called him her Charles the First, had given no small amusement and scandal to the town. Yet, in the midst of follies and vices, his courageous spirit, his fine understanding, and his natural goodness of heart, had been conspicuous. Men said that the excesses in which he indulged were common between him and the whole race of gay young Cavaliers, but that his sympathy with human suffering and the generosity with which he made reparation to those whom his freaks had injured were all his own. His associates were astonished by the distinction which the public made between him and them. ‘He may do what he chooses,’ said Wilmot; ‘he is never in the wrong.’ The judgment of the world became still more favourable to Dorset when he had been sobered by time and marriage. His graceful manners, his brilliant conversation, his soft heart, his open hand, were universally praised. No day passed, it was said, in which some distressed family had not reason to bless his name. And yet, with all his good-nature, such was the keenness of his wit, that scoffers whose sarcasms all the town feared stood in craven fear of the sarcasm of Dorset. All political parties esteemed and caressed him; but politics were not much to his taste. Had he been driven by necessity to exert himself, he would probably have risen to the highest posts in the state: but he was born to rank so high and wealth so ample that many of the motives which impel men to engage in public life were wanting to him. He took just so much part in parliamentary and diplomatic business as to suffice to show that he wanted nothing but inclination to rival Danby and Sunderland,

and turned away to pursuits which pleased him better. Like many other men who, with great natural abilities, are constitutionally and habitually indolent, he became an intellectual voluptuary, and a master of all those pleasing branches of knowledge that can be acquired without severe application. He was allowed to be the best judge of painting, of sculpture, of architecture, of acting, that the Court could show. On questions of polite learning his decisions were regarded at all the coffeehouses as without appeal. More than one clever play which had failed on the first representation was supported by his single authority against the whole clamour of the pit, and came forth successful from the second trial. The delicacy of his taste in French composition was extolled by Saint Evremond and La Fontaine. Such a patron of letters England had never seen. His bounty was bestowed with equal judgment and liberality, and was confined to no sect or faction. Men of genius, estranged from each other by literary jealousy or by difference of political opinion, joined in acknowledging his impartial kindness. Dryden owned that he was saved from ruin by Dorset's princely generosity. Yet Montague and Prior, who had keenly satirised Dryden, were introduced by Dorset into public life; and the best comedy of Dryden's mortal enemy, *Shadwell*, was written at Dorset's country seat. The munificent earl might, if such had been his wish, have been the rival of those of whom he was content to be the benefactor. * * * In the small volume of his works may be found songs which have the easy vigour of Suckling, and little satires which sparkle with wit as splendid as that of Butler."—Vol. ii. pp. 223, 224.

The Royal plan of obtaining submissive Parliaments was a signal failure. The obsequious Lord Lieutenants returned from their counties with the most mortifying refusals, and even the Roman Catholic Sheriffs refused to give false returns. The Corporations, too, were refractory, and when the King could not intimidate them into compliance by the dismissal of aldermen, he resolved to revoke their charters, when the right to do it belonged to him, and to obtain the rest either by a voluntary surrender, or a decision of the King's Bench. The great majority of the burghs, however, refused to abandon their privileges, and the King was driven to new measures of coercion. A second declaration of indulgence was issued on the 27th April 1688, and on the 4th May it was ordered in Council that the declaration was to be read in all the churches. Before the mind of the Anglican Church could be known, the Protestant Dissenters, with Baxter, Bates, and Howe at their head, resolved to take part with the members of the Church in supporting the Constitution, and at a meeting of the Primate and several of the bishops, it was resolved that the declaration ought not to be read. In order to carry these views into effect, a meeting of prelates and deans, headed by Tillotson, Stillingfleet,

Patrick, and Sherlock, agreed to a petition, in which they pronounced the declaration to be illegal, and declared that they could not be parties to its solemn publication in the house of God. This paper, written in the Archbishop's own hand, was signed on Friday evening by himself and six of his suffragans. As the Primate had been long ago forbidden the Court, the six bishops set off for Whitehall, and Lloyd, bishop of St. Asaph, placed the petition in the hands of the King.

"James read the petition," says Mr. Macaulay, "he folded it up, and his countenance grew dark. 'This,' he said, 'is a great surprise to me. I did not expect this from your Church, especially from some of you. This is a standard of rebellion.' The bishops broke out into passionate professions of loyalty; but the King, as usual, repeated the same words over and over. 'I tell you, this is a standard of rebellion.' 'Rebellion!' cried Trelawney, falling on his knees, 'For God's sake, sir, do not say so hard a thing of us. No Trelawney can be a rebel. Remember that my family has fought for the Crown. Remember how I served your Majesty when Monmouth was in the West.' 'We put down the last rebellion,' said Lake, 'we shall not raise another.' 'We rebel!' exclaimed Turner; 'we are ready to die at your Majesty's feet.' 'Sir,' said Ken, in a more manly tone, 'I hope that you will grant to us that liberty of conscience which you grant to all mankind.' Still James went on. 'This is rebellion. This is a standard of rebellion. Did ever a good Churchman question the dispensing power before? Have not some of you preached for it and written for it? It is a standard of rebellion. I will have my declaration published.' 'We have two duties to perform,' answered Ken, 'our duty to God and our duty to your Majesty. We honour you; but we fear God.' 'Have I deserved this?' said the King, more and more angry; 'I who have been such a friend to your Church! I did not expect this from some of you. I will be obeyed. My declaration shall be published. You are trumpeters of sedition. What do you do here? Go to your dioceses and see that I am obeyed. I will keep this paper. I will not part with it. I will remember you that have signed it.' 'God's will be done,' said Ken. 'God has given me the dispensing power,' said the King, 'and I will maintain it.' 'I tell you that there are still seven thousand of your Church who have not bowed the knee to Baal.' 'The bishops respectfully retired.'—Vol. ii. p. 352.

By means which have not been discovered, the petition was printed that very night and circulated in thousands, and a short letter, believed to be by Halifax, and sent to every clergyman, warned him in eloquent language of the danger of submission. The declaration was read only in four out of one hundred places of worship in London, and the Church, as if with one heart, refused to obey the despotic mandate. The Dissenting body ap-

plauded the bishops and the clergy, and the people joined in the triumph of faith over power. •

James stood awe-struck amid the storm which he had evoked. The seven prelates were summoned before the King and Council, and armed with the best legal advice, they repaired to the palace on the 8th of June. The tyrant browbeat them with his usual coarseness, and the Chancellor called upon them to enter into recognisances to appear to take their trial for libel. The bishops refused, and were ordered to the Tower: No sooner had the holy men come forth under a guard, to be conveyed by water to their prison, than the feelings of the people burst forth in one simultaneous expression of admiration. Thousands prayed aloud for them, and blessed them, and dashing into the stream, asked their blessing. The sentinels at the Traitor's Gate asked the prisoners to bless them. The soldiery drank the healths of the bishops, and a deputation of ten non-conformist divines visited them in the Tower. •

On the morning of Sunday the 10th of June, two days after the imprisonment of the bishops, the Queen bore a son, "the most unfortunate of princes, destined to 77 years of exile and wandering, of vain projects, of honours more galling than insults, and of hopes such as make the heart sick." The nation believed that the young prince was a supposititious child; and though the suspicion is now considered unjust, yet it naturally arose from the absence at his birth of every person who had the smallest interest in detecting the fraud.

After remaining a week in custody the bishops were brought before the Court of King's Bench, pleaded *not guilty*, and were allowed to be at large upon their own recognisances. The trial took place on the 29th June in Westminster Hall. The contest between the Crown lawyers and the counsel for the bishops was long and fierce, and from the sudden changes that took place in the hopes and fears of the parties the trial excited the most dramatic interest. The judges were divided on the question of libel; but the jury, with the exception of the brewer to the palace, who at last gave way, were unanimous, and no sooner had the foreman pronounced the bishops NOT GUILTY, than Halifax sprang up and waved his hat. "At that signal," says Mr. Macaulay, "benches and galleries raised a shout. In a moment ten thousand persons who crowded the great hall replied with a still louder shout, which made the old oaken roof crack, and in another moment the innumerable throng without set up a third huzza, which was heard at Temple Bar." The note of triumph passed along the river, and along the streets and highways, with electric speed. Tears were mingled with acclamations. The acquitted prelates took shelter in a chapel from the

tumultuous gratulations of thousands, and the jury, as they retired, received the blessings of the people. Bonfires, rockets, illuminations, and the burning of the Pope, everywhere expressed the popular joy. Whitehall was the only locality where no thrill of gladness was felt, and James, who received the dread news when in his camp at Hounslow, had their impression deepened on his guilty heart by the shouts and cheers of his soldiers.

It was now time that Liberty endangered, and Faith oppressed, should put forth their avenging arm. The flower of the English nobility determined on resistance, and William of Orange appreciating the magnitude of the crisis, resolved to obey the call. Difficulties, however, of no ordinary kind beset his path. He could not trust to a general rising of the people. An armed force was required, and that force must consist of foreign mercenaries, even if he could obtain it. The state of parties in Holland might prevent him from receiving military aid, and as the object of his expedition was to establish a Protestant government in England, how could he enlist in his cause princes attached to the Church of Rome. All these difficulties were gradually overruled by the folly of his enemies and the wisdom of his friends. James threatened to punish for disobedience the whole body of the priesthood, but even the High Commission quailed, and it received its death-blow by the resignation of Bishop Sprat. A royal mandate was dispatched to Oxford, requiring the University to choose Jeffreys as their chancellor, but they had previously elected the young Duke of Ormond. Discontent reigned among all classes, and the clergy, the gentry, and the army, were ready to welcome their noble deliverer.

Animated by these favourable incidents, William was preparing ships and troops for his expedition. Louis withdrew his army from Flanders into Germany, and the United Provinces being thus free from alarm, gave its formal sanction to the expedition of their chief. On the 17th October, 1688, the armament set sail from Helvoetsluys, and the manifesto of William was dispatched to England. Driven back by a storm, the fleet again sailed on the 1st, and the army was landed in Torbay on the 5th November. Under the command of Count Schomberg, it marched into the interior. William reached Exeter on the 9th, and on the 11th, Burnet preached before him in the cathedral. Men of all ranks flocked to the Protestant standard. William's quarters had the aspect of a court, and at a public reception of the nobility and gentry, he said to them, "Gentlemen, friends, and fellow Protestants, we bid you and all your followers most heartily welcome to our court and camp."

James had gone to Salisbury on the 17th. He had been im-

patient for a battle, but now desired a retreat. On the following day Churchill and Grafton fled to the Prince's quarters. Kirke refused to obey the royal commands. The camp at Salisbury broke up. Prince George of Denmark, the Duke of Ormond, and the Earl of Drumlanrig, deserted to the Prince, and with the aid of Lady Churchill, the Princess Anne made her escape from Whitehall, and took refuge in the country house of the noble-minded Duke of Dorset, in Epping Forest.

After receiving intelligence of these events, James summoned the Lords spiritual and temporal to the palace. He yielded to their advice to call a Parliament. He sent Halifax and other commissioners to Hungerford to negotiate with the Prince of Orange, who generously agreed to propositions which were acceptable to the partisans of the King. The negotiation, however, was on James's part a feint. His object was to gain time. The Queen and the Prince of Wales, whom the King entrusted to the charge of M. Lauzun, a French nobleman, made their escape to France. James assured the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs, who had been summoned to his presence, that though he had sent his wife and his child out of England he would himself remain at his post; and with this "unkingly and unmanly" falsehood on his lips, he had resolved in his heart to fly, and he fled at daybreak on the 11th December, 1688, tossing the Great Seal into the Thames as he crossed it in a wherry, and taking the road to Sheerness.

The news of this event spread like wildfire through the city. At the advice of Rochester, the Earl of Northumberland, with his guards, declared for the Prince of Orange, and strove to prevent any breach of the peace. The attempt, however, was to a certain extent fruitless. The cry of No Popery rung through the city. Convents and Catholic churches were demolished. Piles of Popish trumpery—images and crucifixes, were carried about in triumph. The house and library of the Spanish ambassador was consigned to the flames, and it was only by the aid of the military that the hotel of the French ambassador was saved.

While the city was thus heaving beneath this moral earthquake, there was one fiend whose guilty soul quailed under every shock, and started at every sound. With the instinct of carnivorous life, the Judicial Tiger rushed into the thicket;—but an unsuspected Eye detected him in his lair, and, saved with difficulty from the whips and halters of his pursuers, he was conducted to his cage in the Tower. That fiend was Jeffreys—and that Eye was the Eye of an insulted litigant, on whose visual memory the hideous physiognomy had been indelibly impressed. Our readers will doubtless partake in the vindictive pleasure with

which Oldmixon viewed, and with which Mr. Macaulay has painted this remarkable scene. .

"A scrivener, who lived at Wapping, and whose trade was to furnish the sea-faring men there with money at high interest, had some time before lost a sum on bottomry. The debtor applied to equity for relief against his own bond; and the case came before Jeffreys. The counsel for the borrower, having little else to say, said that the lender was a Trimmer. The Chancellor instantly fied. 'A Trimmer! where is he? Let me see him. I have heard of that kind of monster—what is it made like?' The unfortunate creditor was forced to stand forth. The Chancellor glared fiercely on him, stormed at him, and sent him away half-dead with flight. 'While I live,' the poor man said, as he tottered out of the court, 'I shall never forget that terrible countenance.' And now the day of retribution had arrived. The Trimmer was walking through Wapping, when he saw a well-known face looking out of the window of an ale-house. He could not be deceived. The eyebrows indeed had been shaved away. The dress was that of a common sailor, from Newcastle, and was black with coal-dust; but there was no mistaking the savage eye and mouth of Jeffreys. The alarm was given. In a moment the house was surrounded by hundreds of people shaking bludgeons and bellowing curses. The fugitive's life was saved by a company of the trainbands; and he was carried before the Lord Mayor (Sir John Chapman.) * * * When the great man, at whose frown, a few days before, the whole kingdom had trembled, was dragged into the justice-room begrimed with ashes, half-dead with flight, and followed by a raging multitude, the agitations of the unfortunate Mayor rose to a height. He fell into fits, and was carried to his bed, whence he never rose. Meanwhile the throng without was constantly becoming more numerous and more savage. Jeffreys begged to be sent to prison. An order to that effect was procured from the Lords who were sitting at Whitehall; and he was conveyed in a carriage to the Tower. Two regiments of militia were drawn out to escort him, and found this duty a difficult one. It was repeatedly necessary for them to form, as if for the purpose of repelling a charge of cavalry, and to present a forest of pikes to the mob. The thousands who were disappointed of their revenge pursued the coach, with howls of rage, to the gate of the Tower, brandishing cudgels, and holding up halters full in the prisoner's view. The wretched man meantime was in convulsions of terror. He wrung his hands; he looked wildly out, sometimes at one window, sometimes at the other, and was heard even above the tumult, crying, 'Keep them off, gentlemen! For God's sake keep them off!' At length, having suffered far more than the bitterness of death, he was safely lodged in the fortress, where some of his most illustrious victims had passed their best days, and where his own life was destined to close in unspeakable ignominy and horror."—Vol. ii. pp. 561-568.

The return of James to London,—his subsequent flight to

Rochester, and escape to France,—the summary dismissal of the French ambassador,—the meeting of the Convention of the States of the Realm,—and the plans of various parties for the future government of England,—form the remaining topics of the last chapter of Mr. Macaulay's work. After the most anxious discussion of these plans of government, the House of Commons resolved, "that King James the Second, having endeavoured to subvert the constitution of the kingdom, by breaking the original contract between King and People, and, by the advice of the Jesuits and other wicked persons, having violated the fundamental laws, and having withdrawn himself out of the kingdom, had abdicated the government, and that the Throne had thereby become vacant." The House of Lords experienced great difficulty in acceding to this resolution. They refused, by a small majority, to consider the Throne vacant; but a letter from James to the Convention, as usual, assisted his enemies and disconcerted his friends. When the question was again submitted to them, the House of Peers resolved, almost unanimously, that James had abdicated the government, and, by a majority of 62 to 47, it was decided that the Throne was vacant. It was then proposed, and carried without a division, "*that the Prince and Princess of Orange should be declared King and Queen of England.*"

On the 13th of February 1689, both Houses met in the magnificent Banqueting House of Whitehall. The Prince and Princess of Orange took their places under the canopy of State. The resolution of Parliament was read; and after it, the Declaration of Right, embodying the principles of the constitution. In the name of all the Estates of the realm, Halifax requested William and Mary to accept the Crown. William tendered his own gratitude and that of his Queen, and assured the assembled legislators that the laws of England would be the rule of his conduct. Such was the termination of the English Revolution, and such its triumph—Liberty achieved—Law inviolate—Property secured—and Protestant truth established.

Such is a very imperfect analysis of Mr. Macaulay's immortal work. Enriched with the wisdom of a profound philosophy, and laden with legal and constitutional knowledge, these volumes will be read and prized by Englishmen while civil and religious liberty endure. In Mr. Macaulay's historical narratives the events pass before us in simple yet stately succession. In his delineations of character we recognize the skill of a master whose scrutiny reaches the heart even through its darkest coverings. His figures stand out before us in three dimensions, in all their loveliness, or in all their deformity, living and breathing, and

acting. scenes of listening senates—of jarring councils—and of legislative and judicial strife—are depicted in vivid outline and in glowing colours; and with a magic wand he conjures up before us the gorgeous pageantries of state—the ephemeral gaiety of courts—and those frivolous amusements by which time's ebbing sands are hurried through the hour-glass of life. May we not hope that such a work will find its way into the continents of the Old and New World, and reach even the insular communities of the ocean, to teach the governors and the governed how liberty may be secured without bloodshed,—popular rights maintained without popular violence,—and a constitutional monarchy embalmed amid the affections of a contented and a happy people.

We are unwilling to mingle criticism with praise like this; but, occupying the censorial chair, we must not shrink from at least the show of its duties. Mr. Macaulay's volumes exhibit not a few marks that they have been composed with a running pen; and we have no doubt that, in subsequent editions, he will prune some of their redundancies, and supply some of their defects. There is occasionally a diffuseness both of description and discussion. The same ideas occur under a slight disguise, while dates are omitted, and events are wanting to unite different portions of the narrative, and to gratify the curiosity of the reader. The work is obviously defective in the proportion and symmetry of its parts. Historical sketches, sometimes of men beneath any peculiar notice, and literary, ecclesiastical, and political disquisitions often break the continuity and mar the interest of the story: And we occasionally recognise, in argumentative discussions, the copiousness of the writer in search of converts, when we might expect the rigour of the logician in quest of truth. In the early part of Mr. Macaulay's first volume, he frequently illustrates his narrative by analogous or parallel facts drawn from ancient and modern history. These illustrations, however agreeable to the classical scholar, or the learned historian, startle the general reader:

Ionians:

"Rome and her Bishops" to the "Olympian chariot-course of the Pythian oracle,"—the relation "Between a white planter and a Quadroon girl,"—and the robberies "of Mathias and Knipperdoling,"—are not happy illustrations of other relations and events.

The very brilliancy and purity of Mr. Macaulay's style tend, by the mere effect of contrast, to display the most trivial blemishes. We are startled, for example, at the passages in which we are charged "with pleasuring our friends"—with "the accomplishing a design"—with "committing a baseness"—with "the sineture of soldiery"—with giving "allowance" to do any thing—

with "swearing like a porter,"—and with "spelling like a washer-woman." These and similar phrases have doubtless escaped from Mr. Macaulay's pen when the intellectual locomotive was at its highest speed.

We cannot close these volumes without giving expression to the deep and painful feelings which the events they record have left upon our mind. While we rejoice at the triumph of Divine truth over Human error, and of constitutional government over a licentious despotism, we blush at the thought that religion, and the forms and rites of religion, should have been the mainspring of those bloody revolutions which have desolated England. The domestic history of Britain during the seventeenth century is but a succession of plots, and seditions, and rebellions, prompted by religious fanaticism, or springing from religious persecution. The struggle between the popular and the monarchical element was but the result of that fiercer conflict which the Rights of Conscience had to wage against an intolerant priesthood and a bigoted royalty. Opposed by the Church and the Aristocracy, the popular will possessed neither the moral nor the physical strength that was required to change a constitution and dethrone a Sovereign. The Revolution of 1688 would never have been effected had not persecution driven the Anglican Church into rebellion; and the civil liberties of England would never have been secured had not religious liberty been previously achieved by the broadsword of the Covenant. It is the religious principle alone—strong and deep in the soul—pointing to the sure though distant crown,—nerving the weak man's heart, and bracing the strong man's arm, that can subvert dynasties and unsettle thrones; and there is no Government, however stable, and no Constitution, however free, that is safe against the energy of religious truth, or the bitterness of religious error. The Revolutions which are now shaking society to its centre, have been neither prompted nor sustained by religious zeal. Like the hurricane they will but leave a purer atmosphere and a more azure sky. Subverted institutions will reappear purified by fire, and expatriated Princes will return improved by adversity.

With these views we cannot congratulate ourselves as Mr. Macaulay does, that the great English Revolution will be our last. Our beloved country is doubtless safe from popular assault. The democratic arm will never again be lifted up against the monarchy; but a gigantic and insidious foe is now preparing the engines of war, and, inflamed by religious zeal, is now girding himself for a bloody combat. Prophecy—events passed—events passing, and events lowering in our horizon, foreshadow the great

struggle which is to decide between religious truth and religious error. Misled by wicked counsellors, statesmen have combined to break down the great bulwark of Protestantism which Scotland had so long presented to the enemy in one undivided and massive breastwork. The Protestant strength of our sister land, too, has been paralyzed by her recreant priests; and a bigoted king, devoted to the Popery of rubrics and liturgies, is alone wanting to convert the most powerful Church of the Reformation into a fief of the Holy See. The wild population of a neighbouring island are "biding their time," and watching the issue with a lynx's eye. Continental States, anxious to bring bigotry and priestcraft into reaction against popular turbulence, are conspiring to restore a spiritual supremacy in Christendom; and in an atmosphere thus constituted, an electric spark is alone wanting to combine these antagonist elements into one tremendous storm, in which secular religions must either triumph or fall.

ART. VI.—"*Presbytery Examined:*" *An Essay, Critical and Historical, on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland since the Reformation.* By the DUKE of ARGYLL.

THE Author of this work is a very young man, and occupies the highest rank in the Peerage. He is the descendant and representative of men whose memory is held in veneration by the people of Scotland, on account of their labours and sufferings in behalf of Protestantism and Presbyterianism—in the cause of civil and religious liberty. He himself, at a very early period of his life, before, we believe, he had entered upon his twentieth year, defended from the press, with an ability and a boldness that excited the highest admiration, principles which nothing could have led him to espouse but an honest and ardent love of truth and righteousness. The book treats of topics which, though well worthy of the attention of statesmen, and intimately affecting the welfare of nations, have not usually, of late, been much discussed by laymen, but have been left in a great measure to the ministers of religion. On all these grounds the work is one which is fitted to call forth no ordinary measure of interest, and, independently of all adventitious considerations, it has many strong claims to respect and commendation. It manifests ability and eloquence of a high order, and a very considerable acquaintance with some of the subjects of which it treats. It is characterized in general by gravity and seriousness,

and appears plainly to be the production of one who understands what religion is, and who appreciates its value and importance. We do not know that there is any other of our hereditary legislators who has given to the public evidence of possessing at once the talent and the knowledge which would have enabled him to produce such a work; and of all our eminent public men, probably not more than two, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Macaulay, possess in combination so much ability and so much information upon ecclesiastical subjects as this work exhibits; while its Author, though much younger than these distinguished men, has attained to sounder and more accurate views than either of them upon some of the politico-religious questions which are attracting so much attention in the present day.

This Essay was originally intended as a contribution to a periodical work, in the shape of a review of some of the publications of the Spottiswoode Society. The "Spottiswoode" was a society formed a few years ago in Edinburgh, and now, we believe, extinct, for republishing the works of Scottish Prelatists in defence of their peculiar principles and polity. These publications are specimens of prelatie controversial discussion in its worst form and in its most offensive spirit; and are accompanied with notes, which prove that Scottish prelacy retains, in our own day, the principles and the temper which made it so odious to former generations, and which have secured for it the deep and lasting disapprobation and dislike of the Scottish people. The work, however, begun with this view, gradually extended, and it now appears in the shape of a goodly volume, divided into two parts, the first, which occupies about two-thirds of the book, presenting a pretty full and elaborate survey of the ecclesiastical history of Scotland from the Reformation till the Revolution, and the second, giving an exposition and illustration of the leading principles which the Noble Author regards this historical survey as suggesting. To this there is added an Appendix of Notes, chiefly directed against the principles and reasonings of the Free Church, and pervaded by a considerable amount of severity and bitterness.

It is greatly to be regretted, for the Noble Duke's own sake, that the work should have been an occasional one—should have been, in some measure, the result of circumstances, and not of a deliberately-formed and well-digested plan. With all the ability which the Essay manifests, it displays likewise a good deal of confusion—a want of distinct and definite principles; and it contains some indications that its Noble Author is not altogether unconscious that he has not attained himself, and presented to others, a clear, consistent, well-digested system of doctrines, as to the relations of the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities. It was

highly honourable to the Duke of Argyll that he should have thought of writing a review of the Spottiswoode publications, and exposing the true character and tendency of Scottish prelacy and of Church principles :—for this he was well qualified, and this part of his task he has executed most successfully. But it would, we think, have been better if, for the present, he had confined himself to this topic, and given a little more time to reading and reflection, so as at least to have formed a definite and consistent scheme of opinions for himself, before he ventured to pronounce, and to pronounce so dogmatically, upon all the great questions involved in the controversy *inter imperium et sacerdotium*. The old Scottish Presbyterians, whom his Grace so freely charges with extravagance and fanaticism, had read much more extensively, and had reflected much more profoundly, upon these subjects than he has yet done; and we have no doubt that their views, as to their substance, are quite able to stand, without injury, a much more careful and elaborate investigation than that to which he has subjected them. His Grace's present position, ecclesiastically, is not favourable to a deliberate and impartial investigation of these questions; and we fear that he has allowed the position which he has chosen to occupy to affect his opinions, instead of letting his opinions, fairly and freely followed out to their legitimate consequences, determine his position—his ecclesiastical relations. In the early part of the year 1842, his Grace, then Marquis of Lorn, published a "Letter to the Peers, from a Peer's Son," on the constitutional principles which were involved in the Auchterarder Case, and which soon after led to the disruption of the Church of Scotland. In this pamphlet, which exhibited a very remarkable specimen of precocious talent, and an intrepidity and elevation of tone which reminded men of his heroic and martyred forefathers, he proved, most ably and conclusively, 1st, that by the existing laws and constitution of Scotland, the Church was legally entitled to do what she did in the case of Auchterarder, viz., reject the presentee of the patron upon the ground of the opposition of the congregation; and, 2d, that even conceding, for the sake of argument, that this proceeding of the Church was, under the statutes, illegal and *ultra vires*, the utmost extent of interference legally competent to the Civil Court in the matter, was to find that the patron, in consequence, was entitled to retain the fruits of the benefice; and that the control or jurisdiction over the proceedings of the Church Courts which the Civil Courts assumed, was thoroughly precluded by the fundamental principles of the constitution of Scotland, by the powers which the statutes, did not indeed confer upon the Church, but sanctioned or ratified as vested in the Church *jure divino*. His Grace then conclusively

and unanswerably established these important positions; and he still holds them to be true, having unequivocally declared his adherence to them in the Essay which we are now considering. It might have been expected that, when the Legislature sanctioned the violation of the constitution which the proceedings of the civil courts involved, every one who held these positions would have felt himself called upon, in consistency, to cast in his lot with the Free Church. The Duke of Argyll, however, took a different course, and continued a member of the Scottish Establishment; and we fear that, in doing so, he was somewhat influenced, though no doubt unconsciously, rather by some of the accidents and accompaniments of the subject, than by a deliberate and impartial investigation of its intrinsic merits. This position and procedure were certainly not favourable to progress in the clearness and soundness of his conceptions with regard to the principles that ought to regulate the relations of Church and State, or of the ecclesiastical and civil authorities; and it is an easy matter to shew, by a comparison of his *Letter to the Peers* with his *Essay on the Ecclesiastical History of Scotland*, that his views upon this subject are more indefinite and erroneous in 1848 than they were in 1842. If the Duke of Argyll had seen it to be his duty to join the Free Church in 1843, instead of adhering to the Scottish Establishment, we have no doubt that he would now have possessed a much better-defined and more accurate knowledge of the relations of the civil and the ecclesiastical than his *Essay* exhibits; and that he would also have enjoyed a more assured conviction of the firmness and consistency of his position, than, notwithstanding the dogmatism and severity with which he frequently assails the Free Church principles, we feel called upon at present to concede to him.

We mean to devote the remainder of this article chiefly to a brief notice of what we reckon erroneous in the Duke of Argyll's *Essay*; but it is fair, in the first place, to give our readers one or two specimens of the work; and in doing so, we shall select some passages presenting views in which we cordially concur, and which we regard as of no small practical importance.

The following passage contains some striking and important thoughts, most creditable to the talents and character of their author, with respect to the bearing and tendency of "*Church Principles*:"—

"Admit the sacerdotal theory of the nature and authority of 'The Church,' and we admit that from which the whole system of Romanism has been a gradual and natural development. It is possible, certainly, to maintain a successful defence against many of the specific forms of error which have belonged to the Papacy. But even this defence we have to maintain with arms, on the efficiency of which it is not safe

to risk the high interests involved. Brought into ground where reason has no room to work, the fight becomes one of subtilty, doubtful in its progress, and at best but unsatisfactory in its issue. Obscure facts of history—still more obscure memories of tradition—and doubtful passages of possibly misreported Fathers, such are the ruinous positions for which we have to keep up the most laborious contention. But are these fit defences for the citadels of doctrinal Truth? Even if some, by dint of great tenacity of purpose, succeed in maintaining them, do we not feel that others, less skilful or less determined, must infallibly be driven out? This then is one grand objection against the principles of Priesthood—that though despite of them the learned and the acute may possibly maintain themselves in purity of faith, they rob the great mass of mankind of all security against the gradual but steady growth of error and corruption. If the voice of a visible government of Priests be invested with the authority of ‘The Church,’ men will accept, and ought logically to accept, that voice as it comes to them in *their own days*. They have no time, no opportunity, and on those principles, no right, to appeal from its present teaching to its teaching fifteen or sixteen centuries ago. Divines living in the quiet courts of Oxford may defend their Orthodoxy against ‘The Church’ of the sixteenth, by quoting ‘The Church’ of the third or fourth century. But granting that on their own theory this appeal is open to ‘Churchmen,’ it is clear that it is one which the great majority of the human race neither can nor will make; and therefore that if the Truth is to be maintained at all, its interests must be trusted to some more open and more sufficient plea.

“But this is not the only radical objection to the sacerdotal theory of the nature and authority of ‘The Church.’ Not only is it one which removes all security against corruption, but it is one which positively induces and involves it. The grossest practical idolatry which we may see in every Oratory and Chapel and Church in Italy, is but the last developement of the subtle spirit which animates the sacerdotal idea of ‘The Church.’ The poor ignorant peasant who there falls down before a waxen doll, dressed in frocks of tinsel, is but the coarse representative of the more refined idolater who bows to the mystic authority of an immemorial priesthood, calling it ‘The Church’ of God. Such principles we willingly admit do not interfere with earnest personal piety, nor discourage a solemn and devotional spirit. They did not do so when their power was greatest—in the darkest time of the ‘dark ages’—and they do not do so now. But the capital charge against the whole system on which those principles are founded is, not that it checks, but that it misdirects devotion. Its mystic symbolism and its Levitical Priesthood seem rather to add intensity to its religious feelings, in proportion as it gives visible embodiment to the objects of worship. But in the same proportion, likewise, it introduces into the services of Christianity a foreign element of such corrosive power, that purity of faith, and with it, purity of practice, surely, though insensibly decline.

“Against this power the mere restraint of Creeds and Articles are,

as we have lately seen, of little value. Such barriers cannot dam up the subtleties of mind. Nor is there anything mysterious in the influence we ascribe to the 'Church Principles' of Priesthood. The mind which is imbued with them is already entered on the course which has led, and must lead, to grosser degrees of error. Forms and symbols have already caught the mental eye, and rivetted its attention. The outward and the nominal is taking the place of the inward and the real. Symbolism is growing into Idolatry. The transition is easy and often imperceptible. We have only to cherish the natural emotions of reverence, without a corresponding exercise of the reasoning power in choosing the objects of their worship, and by the most natural and certain process, our Faith is converted into Superstition. The laws of our material nature have, naturally, power enough over the conceptions of our spirits. We need not help them to be more material than they incline to be. Idolatry, strange to say, was the besetting sin even of that peculiar people who heard the voice of the Living God.

"It has been necessary to convey spiritual truth to man in language which his human nature could read and understand; and two great methods have been adopted to convey it to him. Under the Old Dispensation there was the language of symbols; under the New there is the language of facts, which at once interpret the symbols, fulfil, and end them. The services of the one were typical and prophetic—typical of spiritual meanings—prophetic of events to come. The services of the other are only suggestive and commemorative—commemorative of events which have come to pass—suggestive of all that those events procured and did. The First Dispensation required a Priesthood, not merely as the mechanical performer of its rites, but as itself one of its most important symbols. But in the Second Dispensation this symbolism has been done away, because it has been fulfilled. And the Priesthood, among the rest, has been summed up and ended. There is no more need of sacrifice; the work and the office of those who were wont to offer it are no more. Christianity is not a Parable; it is a History. There is a corresponding difference, therefore, in the object of its rites. It is their purpose to remind us of facts, and by so doing to keep alive that frame of mind which God requires of us, when we do remember them. We are not called to exercise faith in them; but they call us to exercise faith in things which they bring to mind, not so much symbolically as commemoratively. There is danger enough surely that the mere performance of rites should occupy that place in our religion which is due only to the use we make of them. But how much is that danger increased when we systematically exaggerate the importance, not merely of the rites, but of what may be called the accidents of their administration! To expect spiritual blessings from the efficacy of a rite is perilous enough. It *must* take us very near the edge of our Christian faith,—it may take us into that ritual idolatry which lies wholly outside the boundary. But if, advancing still farther in this direction, in which we are naturally inclined to go, we interpose between ourselves and

the efficacy of the rite, the efficacy of a ceremonial Priesthood, we indeed give ourselves a tremendous impetus down the steep descent which has led, and must lead, to the coarsest idolatry of Rome.

“For two reasons, therefore, the Sacerdotal theory of the nature of ‘The Church’ tends to corrupt the Faith. First, because it commits its purity to a power which controls the exercise of reason, and is not worthy of the trust. Secondly, because in so committing it we allow a principle essentially at variance with Christian truth, and having an inevitable tendency to obscure it more and more.”—Pp. 271-276.

The next quotation is also somewhat long, but we consider it a very interesting and valuable summary of the view that ought to be taken of the present character and past history of the genuine native Scottish Prelacy:—

“We premise one thing, however, in respect to the Episcopal Church in Scotland. That communion, considered as—what it is—a transplant from the Church of England, which gradually, and by legitimate means, has successfully struck root in another country, is thoroughly entitled to sincere respect. But, in so far as it represents, and professes to do so, the spirit and temper of that party with which its name is historically connected, it is to be held, we think, in not much higher estimation than in former times. External circumstances have indeed greatly tended to improve its character; and so far as the influence of these has been inevitable, its character is accordingly improved. But, judging from the publications of the Spottiswoode Society, and such other evidences as have come before us, it continues to retain only too much of its ancient temper. Its clergy are not perhaps now incited by the desire of possessing the revenues of St. Andrew’s or of Glasgow; but they take part with those who were. They would not, probably, urge the persecution of those who attend Presbyterian ‘Conventicles;’ but they identify their party-history, and associate their sympathies, with those who did. They cannot grasp the place, or the power, which their predecessors succeeded in usurping; but they indulge the same spirit of violence and injustice in dealing with the facts and with the characters of history which the elder Scottish Prelacy evinced in dealing with the people and with the laws of Scotland. They twist, and misrepresent, and conceal, and special-plead, in order to secure for themselves that national rank in the history of Scotland which never did belong to them, except by usurpation.

“Whoever doubts this description, or thinks it unwarrantably harsh, let him read the publications of the ‘Spottiswoode’ and other productions of the same school. There is evident throughout, the same bad effects which have ever flowed from the sanctification of human passions by religious parties,—the same contempt of *Jus Humanum* in following self-grateful notions of *Jus Divinum*. And all this, at least in a great degree, is the result of that one passion which has been always the curse of Scottish Prelacy, and the incentive to all its crimes—the ambition of nationality. At this moment, the con-

sequences of this passion threaten the Episcopal Church in Scotland with deserved division. Although owing all it has, and all it had, to the support of English Bishops and English power, Scottish Prelacy roused the indignation of Laud by a display of pettish independence. They wished for a Liturgy; but it must be a Liturgy of their own. Accordingly, the Service Book appeared, with some few Romanist alterations from the English form. But Laud had a principal hand in framing this. It was known all over the world as Laud's Liturgy. The pride of nationality, therefore, has not been entirely satisfied; and more recent patchings have vindicated the right of Scottish Prelacy to a theology more Romanist than that of England. It can boast that, unlike the English Church, it has needed no revival from the school of Oxford—no teaching of Anti-Protestant opinions, for it has held them long ago.

“This boast has much foundation. From its birth to the Revolution—the period during which its character was formed—Scottish Prelacy has been more or less connected, directly or indirectly, with the ‘Popish party,’ and as constantly opposed to the whole genius and tendency of the Scottish Reformation. It is quite natural that its opinions should have a corresponding tendency. It is not our intention, however, in these pages to enter into the merits of any tenet purely theological. It is enough that we point out the opposite tendencies which divide so naturally and so widely the two schools of opinion which are represented by Presbytery and Prelacy in Scotland. But the historical pretensions of the latter, as an existing development of its ancient spirit, and as having an intimate bearing on its ecclesiastical principles, is a matter specially connected with our present purpose. We cannot suffer any concealment or misrepresentation of that stubborn array of facts which stamp Episcopacy in Scotland, from the day when it first appeared in the Reformed Church to the Revolution, as a system destitute of every element of national life—hostile to the rights, to the institutions, to the opinions, and to the prejudices of the people.

“A desperate and fruitless struggle is maintained by the zealous ‘Churchmen’ of Scotland to represent it otherwise. They would actually have us to believe that we entirely mistake the meaning of all those sounds of struggle, of remonstrance, of battle, and of execration, which assail us at every step as we follow the march of Scottish Prelacy. We can understand the feelings which prompt to this attempt, though we are astonished at the rashness of the attempt itself. It would be very desirable, no doubt, if it were possible for them, to throw some better light on the life and course of Scottish Prelacy. But we would seriously warn the Episcopal Church in Scotland from endeavouring the task. We do so for several reasons. In the first place, no religious party can associate its sympathies with such a course, without serious injury to its own character and its own reputation. By doing so, it deliberately places itself under the strongest temptation to indulge in the worst vices of religious animosity—to be violent—unjust—untruthful. In the next place, there is a better way

of removing this scandal upon their name and principles. They can repudiate the connexion. They gain much, and can lose nothing, by so doing. They can retain all their distinctive, and, as we think, their vicious principles unimpaired. They may say—‘It is true that the Reformation in Scotland did not retain Episcopacy; that when its name was introduced, it appeared under circumstances of corruption, and in a false and counterfeited form; that when it became genuine, by being possessed of Apostolical Succession, it was associated with the irregularities of political despotism—then with violence—then with cruel persecution. It is true, therefore, that it was never fairly represented to Scotchmen, and we are not surprised at their fanaticism having been roused against it. Nevertheless, we deem it the foundation-stone of the Christian temple. We cannot recognise as a Church any communion which refuses to build upon it—and we therefore consider ourselves the only representative of “The Church” in Scotland.’ This would be a straightforward, open, intelligible, reputable statement of their views—views which, with all respect to the many excellent men who hold them, we regard as the emptiest superstition.

“But for Scottish ‘Churchmen’ to cling to the desperate ambition of nationality at the expense of identifying themselves with the history of the most corrupt and mischievous religious party which ever has existed in any country—to quibble and misrepresent as to the Episcopal character of ‘Superintendents,’ or of the Prelacy of the Regents,—or to palliate or defend the monstrous course of Scottish Episcopacy under Charles and James II.—this is neither straightforward, nor rational, nor reputable. It must tend, too, to cast some suspicion on their confidence in those far higher claims on which they rest the exclusive ‘Churchism’ of their Church. If those higher claims be just, they had better not be associated with other claims which are so clearly false. On all these grounds, then, the affectation of nationality had better be given up. Let them fall back upon their own independent claims. Considering the position of Episcopacy in Scotland, the principles of Priesthood, in their most stringent and repulsive form, are its natural resource. It is natural that its clergy and more zealous members—placed as they are in a country where every parish church reminds them of the final triumph of its opponent in the great struggle of the Civil Wars—should be deeply imbued with those doctrines in regard to their peculiar spiritual privileges, which, even under less provoking circumstances, must be so grateful to spiritual pride. But for the credit of these opinions, and for its own internal peace, let it not identify itself with the elder Prelacy of Scotland. Let it confess itself a branch of the Church of England. More than once has the spiritual chain, which connects it through the dark vistas of the middle age with the Twelve Apostles, had its failing links welded at the forge of Lambeth. This connexion had better be remembered and cherished—other less honourable connexions had better be relinquished and forgotten. It is better surely for the credit of the Divine right of Bishops, and of Apostolical Succession,

to be connected with a Church which—whatever be the blemishes in its history—has often acted a very honourable part, and now possesses a firm foundation on truth, and a firm hold on national opinion, than with one which, if it deserves the name of Church at all, stands out among all the parties of our history, as the great enemy of civil and religious liberty—as the unscrupulous advocate and employer of oppression—as one of the principal causes of the Civil Wars of Britain, and as the grievous aggravator of the miseries they occasioned.”—Pp. 231-237.

It is but an act of justice to the Duke of Argyll to quote a brief passage, in which he declares his present adherence to those great constitutional principles which he advocated with such singular ability when Marquis of Lorn :—

“The struggle which has ended in the formation of the Free Church, originated very much in the same cause from which all the former struggles of Presbytery began. It arose from the principles of Presbytery being infringed—in violation of natural right, and of positive institution—by an unconstitutional statute. It became more determined from a still more unconstitutional use being made of that statute’s provisions ; and its fatal result was precipitated by the most blind and prejudiced obstinacy on the part of the civil government. The Government of 1637 were hardly more ignorant of the elements they had to deal with than the Government of 1842. The former believed that very few would ultimately resist the Liturgy, until they heard of the aspect and of the arms of the thousand ‘Supplicants’ who crowded the streets of Edinburgh. The latter believed that only some five—or ten—or twenty ministers would maintain their principles at the expense of their livings, until they heard of the number of that resolved procession which, on the 18th of May 1843, tramped with psalm-singing from the Assembly Hall to the Canonmills.* There is this difference to be marked, indeed, between the two governments : That of 1637 had the excuse of bigotry—that of 1842 had not. And it will be recorded in history, not certainly to the honour of those who were responsible, that the institutions of Scottish Presbytery received their most fatal blow under a ‘Conservative’ government, and for the sake of a statute manifestly—undeniably—unconstitutional : because passed manifestly—undeniably—in violation of the Revolution Settlement.”—Pp. 230, 231.

We cordially approve of the Duke of Argyll’s views upon the subject of Scottish Prelacy and the subject of Church Principles, and we believe that he has rendered important service to the cause of true religion by what he has said upon these points ; but we do not concur with him in the opinion “that Scottish Presbytery has left her house of worship needlessly bare of furniture,” (p. 299), though we fear that the chief ground on which we rest our disapprobation of his Grace’s views upon the subject, will be regarded by him as affording another specimen of that tendency

* This “psalm-singing” is a pure fiction.

of Scottish Presbyterians, which he so frequently and so earnestly deprecates, to exalt their notions into religious dogmas resting upon Scriptural authority. We believe that this position can be established upon Scriptural grounds, viz., that it is unwarrantable and unlawful for men to introduce into the worship and government of the Christian Church any rites or arrangements which have not the positive sanction of the Word of God. We take this position, of course, with the necessary and reasonable limitation expressed in the first chapter of the Westminster Confession, "that there are some circumstances concerning the worship of God, and government of the Church, common to human actions and societies, which are to be ordered by the light of nature and Christian prudence, according to the general rules of the Word." Thus understood, we believe the position can be shown to rest upon scriptural authority, and to constitute a law binding upon the Church of Christ in all ages. And if so, it fully warrants all that the most rigid Presbyterians have ever maintained and practised. It is true that the considerations urged by the Duke of Argyll, and by prelatists in general, in favour of a more complete and ornate furnishing of the "house of worship," derived from certain features and tendencies in man's constitution, have some measure of plausibility, and can be made to wear a sort of philosophical aspect; but we think it no difficult matter to show, that it is a much sounder and deeper philosophy which demonstrates, both from an examination of man's constitution and a survey of the testimony of experience, the consummate wisdom of the scriptural prohibition—of the "bareness" which it demands.

But the main object of this Essay, in addition to that of exposing the true character and tendency of Scottish prelacy and of Church principles, is to refute the doctrines and reasonings of the Free Church in regard to the distinctness and mutual independence of the Church and the State, and the unlawfulness of the authoritative interference of the civil power in the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs; and the work may thus be fairly regarded as an exposition of the grounds and reasons why his Grace—though persuaded that those proceedings of the Civil Courts which produced the Disruption of the Church of Scotland were violations of the constitution of the kingdom—did not consider himself called upon to join the Free Church, but continued in communion with the Scottish Establishment. Our space of course forbids our attempting to follow his Grace through the details of his historical and critical investigations, but his leading arguments may, we think, be fairly embodied in the following positions; and we propose making a few remarks upon each of them in succession.

1st, That the doctrine of the Free Church about the incompetency and unlawfulness of the interference of civil rulers in the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs was not held by John Knox and the original Reformers of Scotland, who had the same views in regard to the relation of the Church and State as Dr. Arnold of Rugby !

2d, That the doctrine upon this subject held by the subsequent generations of the Scottish Presbyterians, and now maintained by the Free Church, is one "of mere local origin, and of mere local meaning," the result mainly of circumstances, and of the exaggeration and extravagance which these circumstances produced.

3d, That this doctrine, though plainly taught in the Westminster Confession, has no scriptural authority to rest upon.

4th, That many formidable objections can be adduced against it, especially that it is based upon the ascription of the office and functions of priesthood to ecclesiastical office-bearers, and that it implies that church courts are the representatives of Christ in such a sense as to be entitled on that ground to implicit submission.

And 5th, That the Free Church stands out pre-eminently distinguished even among Scottish Presbyterians for its irrelevant and illogical application of scriptural statements to the defence of its peculiar principles.

1. The Duke is at some pains to establish that John Knox did not teach the doctrine held by the Free Church, and indeed by all Scottish Presbyterians except those now connected with the Establishment, concerning the separation between temporal and spiritual things, and the incompetency and unlawfulness of civil interference in the regulation of the affairs of the Church ; but he has produced no evidence that really bears upon the point which he undertakes to prove. The quotations he has given from Knox, and from the Confession of 1560, prove that our Reformers held that the word of God imposed upon civil rulers certain duties and obligations in regard to the prosperity and welfare of the Church and the interests of true religion, requiring them to aim at these objects, exempting them in the discharge of these duties from implicit submission to the judgment of any other party, and authorizing them to regulate their conduct in aiming at these objects by a sense of their own direct responsibility to God and His word. The Reformers likewise held that the Church of Rome had made unwarrantable encroachments upon the province of the civil magistrate, in assuming jurisdiction in temporal matters, and in exempting the clergy in civil and criminal questions from the jurisdiction of the ordinary tribunals ; and they had no hesitation in calling upon the civil authorities to resist these encroachments, and keep the Church

within its own proper province. It is quite manifest that the statements of John Knox and our first Reformers, when examined deliberately, and viewed in connexion with the occasions which produced them and the immediate purposes to which they were directed, prove nothing more than this, and afford no ground for the allegation that they confounded the provinces of the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities, or that they ascribed to the civil magistrate any jurisdiction or right of authoritative control over others in ecclesiastical affairs. In short, the power which John Knox and the old confession ascribed to the civil magistrate, is also ascribed to him by the authors of our second Reformation and by the Westminster Confession. No one can deny that the Westminster Confession ascribes to the civil magistrate a right to a large measure of interference in regard to religious affairs, and imposes upon him obligations with reference to all the matters which are comprehended within the ecclesiastical province; and every one acquainted with the writings of Gillespie and Rutherford must know that it is quite easy to produce from them statements about the power of the civil magistrate in regard to religion, as strong as any that ever proceeded from John Knox. The truth is, that, at the period of the second Reformation and the Westminster Assembly, Presbyterian writers, being generally accused by their Erastian opponents of denying the just rights of the civil magistrate, because they maintained strictly and resolutely the line of demarcation between things civil or temporal, and things ecclesiastical or spiritual, and denied to him all jurisdiction or right of authoritative control within the Church's province, were particularly careful to bring out prominently and to express strongly, the whole power which they could honestly and consistently ascribe to the civil magistrate in regard to religion, and this was quite as much as John Knox ever conceded to him. The only difference is, that Knox has not laid down the distinction between the provinces and functions of the Church and the State, and the unlawfulness of mutual encroachments, so fully and distinctly as Melville and Henderson and their associates have done, just because the circumstances in which he was placed, the struggles and controversies in which he was engaged, did not lead him to do so. But there is no ground whatever for maintaining that he denied or rejected any of the principles which they, or the Free Church, have held upon these subjects. It is well known that Calvin, who died in 1564, had asserted all the fundamental principles which have since been generally held by Presbyterians, and are now held by Free Churchmen, on this point. The account given in the old Confession of the nature and definition, the functions and objects, of the Church of Christ—and these are the points on

which this whole controversy really turns, make it perfectly palpable that our Reformers never could have concurred, as the Duke alleges they did, in the views of Dr. Arnold. And lastly, the famous letter of Erskine of Dun to the Regent Mar, written in 1571, a year before Knox's death, contains abundant evidence, that they held the same views about the distinction between temporal and spiritual powers and functions as their successors, and were quite prepared to act upon them, whenever, in providence, they might be called upon to do so. His Grace is acquainted with this letter, and it is rather a curious circumstance, that, in 1842, he prefixed as a motto to his Letter to the Peers an extract from it, which asserts the substance of all that Scottish Presbyterians and Free Churchmen have ever contended for. His Grace may have since that time seen reason to change his mind, and to adopt the Erastian, Antipresbyterian views of Dr. Arnold, but he ought not to have ascribed these views to John Knox and the Scottish Reformers.

We must also take the liberty of telling his Grace, that it is utterly inexcusable in any man, after all the discussion which these topics have recently undergone, to imagine, as he does, that he gains anything by proving that John Knox held the right of the civil magistrate to "interfere" in religious matters. It will not do now to run off with the vague and ambiguous idea of "interference." A right of interference in religious matters the Westminster Confession unquestionably ascribes to him, and this right no Free Churchman has ever disputed; but the question, and *the only question*, is, whether he has *such* a right of interference as warrants him to exercise jurisdiction or authoritative control in the regulation of the affairs of the Church, such a right or jurisdiction as entitles him to issue direct formal deliverances upon ecclesiastical questions, *and imposes upon other parties a valid obligation to obedience*. We are not aware that any Scottish Presbyterian has ever ventured formally and explicitly to ascribe to the civil magistrate such a right of interference, although it is quite plain, that every defender of the existing Scottish Establishment is bound, in consistency, either to ascribe to him this right, or to abandon his present position. We doubt much whether the Duke of Argyll, notwithstanding his having adopted Dr. Arnold's views, and notwithstanding his having been able to discover the identity of the views of Arnold and John Knox, would venture to ascribe such a right of interference to the civil magistrate, and yet he ought to have known that nothing, whether in the way of argument or authority, that did not tend to establish *this* right, could afford him any assistance in his assault upon the principles of the Free Church.

2. One great object of the Duke's elaborate survey of the Ecclesiastical history of Scotland, is to establish the position, that the views with regard to the distinctness of the provinces, and the independence of the jurisdictions, of the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities, which were maintained by Melville and Henderson, and which his Grace admits to be the same as those held by the Free Church, were merely of local origin and of local meaning, resulting chiefly from the circumstances in which they were placed, and characterized by exaggeration and extravagance. We cannot enter into the details by which his Grace labours to give plausibility to this piece of Quixotism. But we are confident that he has proved nothing under this head which could not be shewn to apply, more or less, to every arduous and protracted struggle for truth that has occurred in the history of the Church. In every such case, there has been some ground, more or less, for charging even those who were honoured to defend the truth with something like exaggeration and extravagance, with a tendency to over-estimate and overstate the importance of the doctrines for which they were called upon specially to contend and, to suffer, and with the use of language with which the calmer judgment of a subsequent generation might not fully sympathize. We believe that it has never been given to any body of uninspired men to rise wholly, in their precise mode of stating and defending their opinions, even when they were true and sound, above the influence of their position and circumstances, to avoid exhibiting some traces of the weakness and imperfection of the human faculties. It is well to notice these indications of human infirmity as affording useful lessons, but it is unreasonable to dwell upon them, as if they afforded any presumption against the substantial truth and soundness of the opinions in connexion with which they may have been exhibited. We are satisfied that the doctrines of the Scottish Presbyterians of the 16th and 17th centuries, on the subject of the relation of the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities can, as to their substance, be successfully defended against all opponents, except in the one point of their not admitting the views then almost universally rejected, and now almost as universally adopted, upon the subject of toleration and the rights of conscience, and what naturally resulted from this. We are persuaded that as to their mode of stating and defending them, they need as little the allowance that ought to be made for the common infirmities of human nature, as any body of men who have ever been called upon in providence to carry on a protracted struggle, and to endure much suffering, for great principles, and the Duke of Argyll has produced nothing at all fitted to shake these convictions in the mind of

any one adequately acquainted with the subject. The only thing brought forward by his Grace upon this point, which is at once tangible and plausible, is a statement to this effect, that the fact, that our views about the independent jurisdiction of the Church, and the unlawfulness of the exercise of civil authority in ecclesiastical affairs, were not brought out prominently by the first Reformers, but were developed gradually by the struggles with the civil power in which the Church became afterwards involved, affords a proof, or at least a strong presumption, that these views were not really derived from Scripture or sanctioned by its statements. But this notion has no solid foundation to rest upon, and is indeed contradicted by the whole history of the Church. A very large experience has fully proved, that doctrines which can be shewn to be taught in Scripture have been overlooked or disregarded by the Church in general, until events in providence brought them out, pressed them upon men's attention, and led to a more careful examination and a more accurate apprehension of the Scriptural statements which relate to them. Indeed, it might almost be said that scarcely any of the doctrines of Scripture has ever been brought into due prominence, has been fully explained and illustrated, and has been stated and defended with perfect precision and accuracy, until events occurred which made it the subject of controversial discussion, until contradictory opinions concerning it were propounded, and were discussed between men of learning and ability taking opposite sides. No one acquainted with the history of the Church can regard it as affording even the slightest presumption against the Scriptural truth of Free Church principles, that they were first fully and explicitly developed in Scotland by Andrew Melville, in his noble struggle against the unlawful interference of the civil authorities in ecclesiastical affairs.

3. The Duke strenuously contends that Free Church principles about the authoritative interference of the civil power in ecclesiastical matters, though held, as he admits, by Scottish Presbyterians in general since the time of Andrew Melville, and taught in the Westminster Confession, have no foundation in Scripture. His Grace, we have seen, admits that the claims of the Free Church are founded upon the constitution of Scotland, and that the rejection of these claims by the Legislature was a violation of the Constitution. The main grounds on which he and others have rested this conviction, are, that these claims are clearly sanctioned by the great charter of 1592, and by the Act of 1690, c. 5, which embodies and ratifies the Confession of Faith. The whole of the Westminster Confession is at once the standard of the Church and a portion of the civil

law of the land. The Confession professes to be a summary of what is taught in Scripture on the various topics which it embraces, and to contain nothing which does not rest upon Scriptural authority. As such it is received by the Church and by all her office-bearers, and as such it is recognised by the Legislature; so that, if the view taken of the meaning of the 30th chapter of the Confession by the Duke of Argyll and the Free Church be correct, we have the united testimony of the Church and the State, that the principles and claims of the Free Church are not only just and sound in themselves, and fully sanctioned by the constitution of Scotland, but also, moreover, that they are warranted by the authority of the Word of God. In his "Letter to the Peers," he referred to the 30th chapter of the Confession as clearly establishing the principles and claims of Free Churchmen, without any intimation that he did not believe its statements to be in accordance with Scripture, but rather in such a way as seemed to imply that he regarded them as having the sanction of the Word of God, as well as of the law of the land. He then said—

"The Church has declared, *and the constitution has adopted the opinion*, (the italics are the Duke's,) that her government resides exclusively in the hands of her spiritual office-bearers; and farther, that this separation of jurisdictions is not a mere result of human expediency, created and liable to be cancelled by human laws, but is one of Divine appointment, and essential to the wellbeing of both."—*Letter to the Peers*, p. 29.

It is true that there is nothing in his Grace's present opinions to preclude him from adopting this statement as it stands, but it is more than probable that if he had believed then as he does now, that both the Church and the Constitution were wrong in holding this great principle to rest upon Divine appointment, he would have given some indication of this opinion. We fear, then, his Grace's opinions upon this subject have undergone a change, and it is one which we do not regard as an improvement. We cannot but suspect that it is to be ascribed not to a more deliberate and impartial examination of the subject on its merits, but to the influence of the writings of Dr. Arnold, and of the unfortunate position which he has chosen to occupy as an adherent of the Scottish Establishment. His Grace may, perhaps, think that he can consistently remain in the Established Church while maintaining, as he does, that an important article in its creed is inconsistent with Scripture, but he could scarcely have adhered to it, if he had felt himself compelled to admit, that on the precise question which produced the Disruption, the principles of the Free Church had the express sanction of the Word of God.

It will be proper to quote his Grace's deliverance upon the

important doctrine which is taught in the 30th chapter of the Confession, and which may be said to be the basis and foundation of the controversies which have attracted so much attention, and led to such important consequences. The doctrine is this:—“The Lord Jesus Christ, as King and Head of the Church, hath therein appointed a government in the hands of Church-officers distinct from the civil magistrate.” And his Grace’s commentary upon it is as follows:—

“When analyzed it is simply an assertion: 1st, Of the fact that Christ is King and Head of His Church; 2d, That He has appointed a government in the hands of Church-officers; 3d, That He has ordained that this government should never, under any circumstances, be interfered with by, or merged in, the civil government of society. The first assertion is an indisputable truth, although a truth of so indisputable and so abstract a nature that we must watch, with jealous care, the use which controversialists, and priests especially, may make of it. The second assertion is one which has a certain degree of truth in it—enough to make it very easily received and very incautiously handled—so that suddenly we may find ourselves committed to assertions which are not true—but false. The third is an assertion which I unhesitatingly declare my belief to be utterly groundless and untenable, unsupported by the shadow of proof from any relevant part of Scripture—unnatural, and at variance with the spirit of the Christian scheme, and so repugnant to the true instincts of all men that Presbytery itself has repeatedly and perpetually been flying in the face of its own dogma, whenever that dogma ceased to be serviceable as an entrenchment against assaults upon itself.—*Essay, Note II., p. 317.*

We must call the attention of our readers to the importance of the admission here made, viz., that the fundamental principle of the Free Church is clearly sanctioned by this statement of the Confession. Before the Disruption the controversy was carried on chiefly between two bodies of men in the same Church, who had both equally subscribed the Confession, and who professed to regard all its statements as sanctioned by Scripture. The one of them, those who now form the Free Church, were in the habit of appealing to this doctrine of the Confession as affording a complete sanction to the leading principles which they professed, and to the general course of conduct which they pursued. Those with whom they then argued could not dispute the authority of this statement which they themselves professed to receive as a doctrine of Scripture. They were unable to distort or pervert its meaning so as to show that it did not sanction Free Church principles and practice, and, accordingly, judging discretion to be the better part of valour, they carefully abstained from considering it. During the whole controversy that preceded the Disruption, not one of those who now constitute the Establishment ever ventured to grapple with this statement of the Con-

fession, though often challenged to do so. But now that the Duke of Argyll, a member of their own communion, has publicly maintained, 1st, that this doctrine of the Confession is untrue, and, 2d, that it fully sanctions Free Church principles, we hope that some of the ministers or professors of the Establishment will be constrained to come forward in defence of their standards and their position; and we trust, that when thus called upon to defend the Scriptural truth of one of the doctrines of their standards, they will at the same time embrace the opportunity of supplying the strange omission of which they have hitherto been guilty, by trying to explain how it is that, in consistency with this doctrine, they can oppose Free Church principles and defend their own.

The Duke has made what we must take the liberty of calling an unworthy attempt to throw discredit upon this statement of the Confession, by perverting a passage from Baillie, describing the circumstances in which the Westminster Assembly adopted it. Baillie's statement is this:—"Coming on the article of the Church and Church notes, to oppose the Erastian heresy, which in this land is very strong, we find it necessary to say, that;"* and then follows the passage substantially as we now have it in the Confession. This passage of Baillie has been often quoted by Free Churchmen for the purpose of showing that the statement in the Confession was intended, as it is certainly fitted, to exclude all Erastianism, *i.e.*, the ascription of *any* jurisdiction or authoritative control to the civil magistrate in the affairs of the Church. The Duke's commentary upon it is this:—

" 'We find it necessary to say!'—This is a full and accurate explanation of the origin of that passage of the Confession which, in the form I have above examined, reasserts that which Scottish Presbytery had very often 'found it necessary' to assert before.—What we find it 'necessary to say' we are very easily persuaded to be true."—P. 319.

This seems intended to insinuate that the *necessity* under which they acted did not arise from a conviction of truth and a sense of duty, but from some inferior or unworthy consideration, or at best from some temporary controversial emergency. Now, this insinuation is wholly unwarranted by anything said by Baillie, or by anything in the known character or situation of the men. The necessity under which they acted was only that of stating plainly and fully what they believed to be the truth of God upon the point, and of stating it in such a way as to exclude the opposite error, even in the subtlest form into which it might be cast

* This is evidently the right punctuation, although Laing's admirable edition of Baillie follows the old one, which is full of such blunders, in not putting a period before "Coming," and in putting one after "strong."

by the able and learned Erastians with whom they had to contend. It was their duty to do this, and it was necessary just because it was their duty. They discharged it well and wisely, and the history of the Church proves that in laying down this position they rendered a permanent service to the cause of truth. The English Parliament, under Erastian influence, excepted the 30th and 31st chapters from their ratification of the Confession.* No such exception, however, was made by the Scottish Parliament in 1690, and the consequence has been, that those who, in the recent controversies, were manifestly acting under Erastian influences and pursuing an Erastian course of conduct, did not venture openly to avow Erastian principles, and that when the Duke of Argyll fell into the "Erastian heresy," he was compelled openly to renounce this portion of the standards of his own Church. All honour to the far-sighted men who saw the necessity which a regard to the permanent interests of truth imposed on them, and acted on it.

We do not mean to enter into any exposition of the Scriptural evidence for the doctrine of the Confession, or into any refutation of the Duke's attempt to shew that it has none, because this is not a very suitable occasion for such a work, because his Grace has really done little more than assert, in very strong and dogmatic terms, the irrelevancy of some of the Scriptural statements commonly adduced in support of it, and because we would not like to anticipate the champions of the Establishment, who are no doubt preparing to come forward to defend their standards against his Grace's attack upon them. We think it more important, and more appropriate at present, to give a compendious connected statement of what the Scriptural principles are which the Free Church maintains, and which she admits to be necessary, but at the same time holds to be amply sufficient, for the defence of her position, so far as concerns the general subject of the relation between the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities. We have no material objection to make to the Duke's statement formerly quoted, of what is contained in the extract from the Confession so often referred to; but we think that the principles of the Free Church may be stated in such a way as

* Noal's History of the Puritans: Part III. c. viii., and Part IV. c. iii., vol. ii. pp. 429 and 691, of edition of 1837, in 3 vols.

It is a curious and interesting circumstance, that among the instructions sent by the leading Presbyterian divines of Scotland to Sharpe, while their agent in London, at the time of the Restoration, one was that he should labour to procure the civil sanction for these portions of the Confession. Wodrow has preserved a paper, sent to him from Scotland, and drawn up by Robert Douglas, which contains the following passage:—"For England, it is expected from the Parliament thereof, that is shortly to sit, that they will ratify the 30th and 31st chapters of the Confession of Faith, as well as the late Parliament (the Long Parliament) hath ratified all the rest of it."—*Wodrow's History. Introduction*, vol. i. p. 15.

to make more palpable, both their true import and their relevancy to the practical questions on which they have been brought to bear, and in such a way likewise as to include some points not perhaps actually contained in the statement of the Confession, but fairly deducible from it, or intimately connected with it.

Her principles then upon this subject are these:—

1st, That the visible Church of Christ, and every branch or section of it, is an independent society, distinct from the kingdoms of this world, and differing from them in many essential particulars—its origin, nature, constitution, government, subjects, objects, &c.

2d, That Christ is its only King and Head, and that He alone can settle its constitution and laws, and determine how its affairs are to be regulated.

3d, That the Sacred Scripture is the only rule or standard for regulating its constitution and laws, and the ordinary practical administration of its affairs.

4th, That the only parties authorized to administer the ordinary affairs of this society, according to the constitution and laws which Christ has prescribed, are ecclesiastical office-bearers, appointed and qualified according to the Word of God.

5th, That the civil magistrate, though bound to aim in the exercise of his lawful jurisdiction in civil or temporal things, at the prosperity of the Church of Christ, does not as such possess any jurisdiction or right of authoritative control in ecclesiastical or spiritual matters, and of course cannot, by any laws he may pass, or by any decisions he may pronounce, impose a valid obligation to obedience upon the Church in general, or upon her office-bearers, in the execution of their respective functions.

6th, That the distinct government which Christ has appointed in his Church—the spiritual or ecclesiastical province—the sphere within which ecclesiastical office-bearers possess jurisdiction, or are entitled to exercise a certain ministerial (not lordly) authority, comprehends not only the preaching of the Word and the administration of the sacraments, but also the whole of the ordinary necessary business of the Church as a visible society,—the whole of these processes which must be going on wherever the Church is fully executing its functions; in short, the exercise of discipline, including of course the admission and exclusion of members, and the ordination and deposition of office-bearers.

And 7th, That Christ having established all these arrangements as King and Head of the Church, the maintenance of them on the one hand, and the infringement of them on the other, specially concern His honour and dignity as the Church's only head and ruler.

All these positions, we are persuaded, can be fully established upon Scriptural authority, not indeed by express texts which assert them *in terminis*, but by fair and legitimate deduction from Scriptural statements and principles; and being sanctioned not only by the Word of God, but also by the law of the land, they form, in their practical application, a conclusive vindication of the course pursued by those who now constitute the Free Church in the struggle which led to the Disruption. There is nothing in them that has any appearance of extravagance, or that seems to go beyond the general scope and strain of scriptural language. They have been held in substance by almost all Christian Churches, except those which having basely yielded to the usurped authority of the civil powers, were constrained to beat about for something to excuse or palliate their unworthy submission, and with this view were tempted to labour at the degrading task, in which the Duke of Argyll has done his best to aid them, of involving the doctrine of Scripture upon the subject in obscurity and uncertainty. There have, no doubt, been cases in which men have shown an undue tendency to claim Scriptural authority for their peculiar notions, and to represent points as settled by Scripture, on which it cannot be proved to have given any deliverance. But the tendency has been far more common, and quite as injurious, to contract unduly the circle of topics, in regard to which Scripture gives us sufficient materials for determining our opinions and our conduct, and to represent as open and unsettled—as affording fair scope for the exercise of human wisdom, the operation of worldly motives, and the influence of temporary circumstances, subjects, which it can be satisfactorily proved, that the Word of God has irreversibly determined. The allegation of either of these errors in any particular case cannot be established by general presumptions, or by adventitious considerations, but only by an investigation of the precise grounds in which, in each case, Scriptural warrant is either asserted or denied. Even if the Duke of Argyll had proved his position, that Scottish Presbyterians have in some instances shown an undue tendency to exalt their peculiar opinions into religious dogmas resting upon Scriptural authority, we would still insist that their views upon the distinctness and mutual independence of the civil and the ecclesiastical powers should be tried upon their own merits, and it would then be no difficult matter to shew that their principles upon this subject, in the form in which we have stated them, can be proved to have the sanction of the Sacred Scriptures, and to constitute the general directory by which the Church of Christ, and all its branches—every society, great or small, calling itself a Church of Christ, ought to be regulated in every age and country.

The Duke admits that there is a good deal of truth and soundness in these general principles, and intimates that he would not object much to receive them, if their supporters would abandon all claim on their behalf to a *jus divinum*, and be contented with a mere *jus humanum*, so as to leave room for the authoritative interference of the civil power in the government of the Church, and for some measure of accommodation to the devices of human wisdom and the influence of external circumstances. He admits that the Church is entitled to the privilege of self-government, but he regards this privilege as resting only upon a natural right, such as is common to it with other societies. The whole controversy may be said to turn upon the Church's right to the power of self-government, and much may be adduced in confirmation of the views of Scottish Presbyterians upon this subject, from the principles of natural right as applicable to societies in general. But the application of the general principles of natural right to particular cases must be regulated by correct views of the origin, nature, and constitution of each society. If the Church is a mere corporation, created by the State, and receiving from the State a delegated power of self-government, then of course the State may withdraw or modify this power. But if the Church be, by its institution, a distinct and independent society, subject to Christ as its only sovereign, and to his word as its only law, then the principles of natural right as well as a regard to Christ's authority, reclaim against any other society assuming any jurisdiction over it, and against any party, whether within or without the Church, deviating in any respect from the arrangements which he has sanctioned as to its constitution and government. The Church has not a right to self-government even upon natural principles, unless it be a distinct and independent society; and if it be a distinct and independent society, then the principles of natural right are sufficient to establish the inviolability of its title to the power of self-government.* But it is only from Scripture that it can be proved to be in its nature and constitution a distinct and independent society, and the same Scripture that establishes this fundamental position, lays down certain general principles as to

* If his Grace had been acquainted with the writings of the eminent men who have defended Erastianism in former times, he would probably have admitted that a *jus naturale* might be sufficient to exclude interference and change in the regulation of the affairs of the Church, as well as a *jus divinum*. Grotius, a very high authority on such a subject, and the more so, in some respects, because of his Erastianism, while conceding it to be naturally just and right that Christian congregations should choose their own office-bearers, denies that this arrangement is so fixed and determined as not to admit of being altered by the interference of the civil power; but in labouring to support this position, he distinctly admits that a *jus naturale* might establish immutability and exclude interference, as well as a *jus divinum positivum*.—*De imperio summorum potestatum circa sacra*, c. x., s. 3.

its constitution and government, its relation to Christ and his Word, which, when fairly and honestly applied, exclude the civil power from all right of authoritative interference in the regulation of its affairs, and make it unlawful, as being a violation of duties which Christ has imposed, for the Church to be a consenting party to any such interference.

4. We must now hasten to advert briefly to the principal objections which the Duke has adduced against the doctrine that has been generally held by Scottish Presbyterians, in regard to the exclusive jurisdiction of "Church officers" in ecclesiastical matters, and the unlawfulness of the authoritative interference of the civil power in the regulation of the affairs of the Church. His first and principal objection is, that this doctrine can consistently rest only upon an ascription of the office and functions of priesthood to the office-bearers of the Christian Church. But this is a pure misconception, having no solid or even plausible ground to rest upon. We, of course, in common with all Scottish Presbyterians, disclaim the idea of the existence of any priesthood in the Christian Church, except the priesthood of Christ. We abjure all intention of ascribing any priestly power to Christian ministers or to Church Courts; and we maintain, that neither the principles which we hold, nor the arguments by which we defend them, afford any appearance of ground for the allegation on which this objection is based. All that the Duke has adduced in support of this objection is mere vagueness and confusion; and he has made no attempt to apply it, specifically and in detail, either to the statement of our principles, or to the course of argument by which they are commonly defended. His Grace has neither attempted to show that Scottish Presbyterians have ever ascribed any priestly power to Church Courts, nor to prove distinctly and in detail, that any of the arguments they have used require them in logical consistency to do so. He has done little more than repeat the assertion, that our principles imply, or lead to, the ascription of a priestly power to ecclesiastical office-bearers. But this matter cannot be allowed to rest upon a mere assertion, or a vague impression of resemblance. We ask his Grace to survey in detail the statement we have given of our principles, and the course of argument by which they are usually defended, and to point out distinctly, where and how it is, that the idea of priestly power and function does come in, or, in logical consistency, should come in, and we are very sure that if he attempt this he will be utterly unsuccessful.

Our principles, indeed, necessarily imply that it is Christ's will that there should be office-bearers in his Church, as distinguished from ordinary members; and that these office-bearers should perform certain duties and execute certain functions.

We presume that his Grace, being a Presbyterian, will not formally dispute this position, and yet he has made a sort of attempt to evade it or set it aside, by representing the authority and functions of office-bearers as resting solely upon natural principles, and by describing them as merely the representatives of the people. Presbyterian, in common with almost all other Churches, reject this notion, and maintain upon Scriptural grounds, that it is a part of the constitution which Christ has prescribed to his Church, that it should have certain office-bearers, qualified and appointed according to his directions, and that these office-bearers, when so qualified and appointed, have authority from him, and not merely from those who elected and ordained them, to execute certain functions, and to do so in accordance with his word, without regard to any other rule or standard. It thus appears, that while his Grace unwarrantably charges us with elevating, in opposition to Presbyterian principles, ecclesiastical office-bearers to the position of priests, he has been tempted to fall into the opposite extreme, and to violate Presbyterian principles, by sinking them to the position of mere representatives of the people. Upon Scriptural and Presbyterian principles, ecclesiastical office-bearers are neither priests on the one hand, nor mere representatives of the people on the other. They are functionaries, for whose appointment Christ has made provision, whose position and duties he has settled, and who, when once appointed in accordance with his directions, are both entitled and bound to look to him as their only master, and to his word as their only rule. So much for the general position and standing of office-bearers in the Christian Church, and their general right to execute certain functions.* With regard to the precise nature and extent of these functions, our principles do not attach to them anything priestly, and we are not required in consistency to do so by any of the arguments we ever employ. The function of ecclesiastical office-bearers consists in the administration of the ordinary necessary business of the Church as a visible society; and no priestly power is involved in, or necessary to, the execution of this function. Indeed the whole of what we ascribe to them may be defended upon natural principles, as justly and rightfully belonging to the legitimate office-bearers of a society.

* A good deal of prominence has been given of late, in opposition to Popish and High Church claims, to the non-priesthood of ministers and ecclesiastical office-bearers, and to the universal priesthood of believers. These are Scriptural and important principles. But it requires some knowledge and discrimination to apply them aright, and to guard them against perversion and abuse. The Duke of Argyll does not understand them, and he has, in consequence, been led into a denial of some important principles with regard to the constitution of the Church of Christ, which have always been strenuously maintained by Presbyterians, though not by them exclusively.

But we do not rest it solely upon this ground. We think we can prove from Scripture that Christ has attached this function to their office, and that therefore neither the people nor the civil magistrate is entitled to take it from them, or to interfere authoritatively in regulating the mode of its execution. But there is nothing priestly in the nature or constituents of the function, and the unlawfulness of authoritative interference from any quarter is based *solely* upon this consideration, that it is an interference with the provision which Christ has made as to the way and manner in which the administration of the ordinary necessary business of his Church as a visible society, is to be conducted. There is no dispute at present about the preaching of the word or the administration of sacraments. The recent controversy turned only upon the administration of discipline, that is, in substance, admission to and exclusion from ordinances, and ordination to and deposition from office. And there is certainly no assumption of priestly power necessarily involved in the execution of this function. If there are to be ordinances administered and office-bearers appointed, then this function must necessarily be executed by some party; and the only question is, to what party Christ has committed it. The party to whom he has committed it, is entitled and bound to execute it, in subjection to him, and in accordance with his word; and no other party is warranted to assume jurisdiction or authoritative control in the matter.

Let it be observed, that in the statement of our principles, we have said nothing whatever about the bearing of admission to and exclusion from the communion of the visible Church, or of ordination and deposition, upon men's relation to God, and their eternal destinies; and that there is nothing in any part of the argument by which we defend our principles, requiring us to assume any definite position, or to indicate any opinion whatever, upon this point. Views have indeed been propounded upon this subject which would fully warrant the charge against their supporters, of claiming for ecclesiastical office-bearers a priestly domination. But these views have never been professed by Scottish Presbyterians. Any deliverance upon this subject is unnecessary either to the statement or the probation of our case, and belongs to a wholly distinct and ulterior question.

The Duke imagines that he makes a very strong point against us when he shews that our Presbyterian principles prevent us from ascribing to Church communion and sacraments, to ordination, and to the exercise of the power of the keys, the important results or consequences which Papists and High Churchmen ascribe to them. But this is trifling. We have never put forth any claims to priestly domination, and we have never made any

attempt to establish such claims. His Grace seems first to assume that we put forth claims to priestly domination, and then he holds us up to ridicule, because we do not follow out these claims to their legitimate consequences. But the truth is, that we claim nothing more for the Church than the right of self-government as a distinct independent visible society. We claim nothing more for ecclesiastical office-bearers than the right of administering, in subjection to Christ, the ordinary necessary business of this society, or of deciding, according to the word of God and their own conscientious convictions, without being subject to any civil or foreign authority, those questions concerning the admission of particular men to office and ordinances, which must be continually arising wherever a Church exists. We claim this, and nothing more; but we claim it not merely on natural but on Scriptural principles. We claim it on the ground of an arrangement which Christ has made, and has indicated with sufficient plainness in his word, and which therefore we are not at liberty either to disregard or to infringe. It is true, indeed, and this seems to have confused and misled his Grace, who can scarcely be supposed to be very intimately conversant with these subjects, and ought not therefore to have written so dogmatically about them, that, not Presbyterians only, but Protestants in general, have regarded some of the Scripture texts which the Church of Rome is accustomed to quote in support of the priestly domination which she claims, as applicable in some sense to the ordinary powers of Ecclesiastical office-bearers in the administration of the ordinary affairs of the visible Church. But he ought to have known, that Protestants have always been careful to point out the distinction between their sense of these passages, and that which Papists attach to them; and he might have admitted the possibility at least, that the Protestant interpretation of them might be true, while the Popish one is false, and that Protestants might be warranted in deriving from them some countenance for their moderate and reasonable claims, without being suspected of participating in the extravagant pretensions to priestly domination which are put forth by the Church of Rome. Enough, we hope, has been said to shew the baselessness of his Grace's allegation, that the principles of the Free Church imply an ascription of priestly powers and functions to ecclesiastical office-bearers. It has been shewn, that neither in the nature of the function assigned to them, nor in the *only* principle on which there is claimed for them exemption from all authoritative civil control in the execution of this function, is there any ground for this allegation.

We would now advert to the Duke's second leading objection to the principles of the Free Church, viz., that they imply a vir-

tual identification of Church Courts with Christ, in whose name they act, and on this ground claim for these Courts infallibility, and demand implicit submission to their decisions. This is a vulgar misrepresentation, and it is easy to shew of it, as of the former objection, that it has no solid foundation either in the statement of Free Church principles, or in any of the arguments by which they are commonly defended. We have never claimed infallibility, or demanded implicit submission for Church Courts; and we have never propounded any principles that required us in consistency to do so. We have always professed to produce from the Word of God the grounds and reasons of the principles we have advocated, and of the course we have pursued. We have always admitted that we were bound to produce Scriptural authority for our opinions and practices, and that unless we succeeded in doing this, we had no right to claim assent or approbation. We have professed to produce Scriptural warrant for all we have said or done, both about the election of ministers, and about the relation, generally, between the civil and the ecclesiastical authorities. We have never claimed for Church Courts an *exclusive* right to interpret Scripture, or expected that any man was to receive our opinion or practice as Scriptural *because* Church Courts had asserted it to be so. We have uniformly, not admitted merely, but contended, that the civil magistrate is entitled and bound to judge for himself, on his own responsibility, of the meaning of the Word of God, and of the Scriptural warrant for the decisions and proceedings of Church Courts, with a view to the discharge of his own duty, whatever that may be, and the regulation of his own conduct, in the exercise of his lawful jurisdiction in civil or temporal matters. We have uniformly asserted the same right for every individual—the right of judging upon his own responsibility, whether the decisions of Church Courts are accordant with Scripture, with a view to the regulation of his own conduct, in so far as he may be affected by them. We have simply contended that Church Courts, being the parties who are alone authorized to administer the ordinary necessary business of the Church as a visible society, should also be left at liberty to act according to their own conscientious convictions of the meaning of God's word, *without being subject to the authoritative control of a party not vested with jurisdiction in that province*. We claim this for them and nothing more, and we claim it both on the general ground of liberty of conscience, and on the more special ground that Christ has invested them and no other party with this function, and that he has not only not authorized, but has virtually forbidden them to be guided by any other rule than his own will, as revealed in his word. We can

honestly and consistently adopt the words of Richard Baxter, when answering similar misrepresentations adduced against the Nonconformists by prelatist Erastians, "it would satisfy us had we but freedom in our ministerial action, *not to go against our conscience*, however blind malice would make the world believe that it is some papal empire even over princes that we desire."*

That this is really the whole extent of the claim which has been put forth in behalf of Church Courts, and that they have not pretended, while contending for the headship of Christ, to identify themselves with him, and upon this ground to demand implicit submission, will be evident from considering the way and manner in which the subjects of the exclusive supremacy of the Bible, the exclusive jurisdiction of Church Courts in ecclesiastical matters, and the exclusive headship of Christ over his Church, were brought into the controversy which led to the Disruption, and from adverting to the real application that has been made of them in defence of the conduct of the Free Church. The Church resolved in 1834, that she would never again intrude ministers upon reclaiming congregations. She did not expect that men were to approve of this principle of non-intrusion, merely because she had adopted it and resolved to act upon it. She professed to prove that this was a true and sound principle, and obligatory upon the Church of Christ. She proved this from Scripture, reason, experience, and her own constitutional standards, not to mention the united testimony of the primitive Church, and the great body of the Reformers. The civil power interfered, and virtually required the Church to abandon this principle, and to resume the old practice of intrusion. The Church answered, that she had not changed her mind, and therefore could not change her practice, that she still believed, and undertook to prove, that the principle of non-intrusion was sound and obligatory, and that therefore she could not abandon or violate it. And when further urged to abandon or violate this principle, upon the ground that the civil power required her to do so, her answer was in substance this—that as a Church of Christ, (for we leave out of view the legal or constitutional aspect of the question,) she was not only not bound, but not at liberty, to defer to this requisition of the civil power, *for that* the word of God was the only rule by which the affairs of the Church ought to be regulated, and ecclesiastical office-bearers were the only parties authorized by Christ in his word to manage these affairs according to this rule. Of these positions, too, she professed to produce proof from Scripture, and she claimed assent to them only upon the ground that this proof was satisfactory. She drew

* True and only way of Concord, Part III., p. 126.

from them this important practical conclusion, that the civil magistrate has no jurisdiction or right of authoritative control in ecclesiastical matters, and that therefore no enactment or decision of his can cancel the obligation of the Church to be guided by the word of God and her own conscientious convictions, and far less can impose upon her an obligation to act in opposition to them. And the practical result of the whole was, that, upon the grounds which have now been stated, the Church considered herself warranted simply *to disregard or set aside the adverse interference of the civil power*, to treat it as a non-entity, as affording no warrant, and imposing no obligation, to change her conduct and to abandon the principle of non-intrusion, which she still believed and proved to be sound and obligatory. These are all the principles, and this is the whole process of argument, that are necessary for the full and conclusive vindication of the conduct of those who now form the Free Church, in their struggle with the civil authorities.

These statements embody the substance of the whole of the strict and proper dialectics of the controversy that led to the Disruption, viewed in its higher aspects, in its bearing upon the duty and conduct of the Church as a Church of Christ. Nothing more is necessary for the formal logical vindication of the whole principles asserted, and of the whole course pursued. And we challenge the Duke of Argyll to shew that there is anything in the argument that is unsound and sophistical in itself, or that affords any appearance of foundation for the objection which we are considering. He will say, no doubt, that it is on the views held by the Free Church in regard to the sole headship of Christ, that the objection is based. But this is really nothing better than an evasion. We have taught no doctrine upon the subject of the headship of Christ but what we profess to prove from Scripture, we have claimed assent to our views upon no other ground than the Scriptural evidence we could adduce in support of them, *and we have not brought forward the doctrine of Christ's headship as furnishing directly and immediately the proper ground or reason of anything we have done ourselves, or called upon others to do.* We admit that the only inference directly and immediately deducible from the doctrine of Christ's sole headship is, that every intimation which he has given of his will as to the constitution and government of his Church, and the manner in which the administration of its affairs should be conducted, ought to be implicitly obeyed. We admit, farther, that this general inference does not, directly and of itself, afford a full vindication of the proceedings which led to the Disruption, and that with that view, it is needful, in addition, to establish from Scripture the doctrines of the exclusive supremacy of the Bible, and the exclu-

sive jurisdiction of ecclesiastical office-bearers, as involved in or flowing from the doctrine of Christ's sole headship. It is with these two doctrines of the exclusive supremacy of the Bible, and the exclusive jurisdiction of ecclesiastical office-bearers, that we directly and immediately connect the formal defence of our cause as a question of dialectics. We do not introduce the doctrine of Christ's headship as affording a distinct and independent argument on which to rest our vindication, but rather as the basis and foundation of these two subordinate, but still important truths, the application of which to the practical matter in hand, constitutes the direct and proper argument on which we rest our case, and with which we call upon our opponents to deal. The headship of Christ then is not to be regarded in this matter as a distinct and separate doctrine from the exclusive supremacy of the Bible and the exclusive jurisdiction of ecclesiastical office-bearers, or as introducing any new and independent element immediately into the strict and proper argumentation of the question, but as a great general Scriptural principle, including or comprehending these two doctrines, furnishing the basis on which they rest, the source from which they spring, the point to which they are attached. The right use and application of the doctrine of Christ's headship in the present question, is not that it should be held forth as the direct and immediate ground of the precise argument by which the course pursued by the Free Church is to be defended against opponents, but rather, that it should be employed to enforce the importance of the doctrines comprehended under it and flowing from it, on which the strict argument more immediately depends, to impress the deep responsibility connected with the faithful maintenance and the full and honest application of these doctrines, and to animate and encourage to an uncompromising discharge of the Church's duty with respect to everything involved in, or flowing from, or in any way connected with, "the crown rights of the Redeemer," to whatever dangers she may in consequence be exposed. This was the use and application made of the doctrine of Christ's headship, by the Scottish Presbyterians of the 16th and 17th centuries, and this is the use and application made of it by Free Churchmen. No other use or application of it is required by any of the principles they have ever professed, or by any of the arguments they have ever employed in defence of them, and no other is needed for the full vindication of the course they have pursued. Now, this use or application of it manifestly does not afford a shadow of ground for the allegation that our Church Courts in contending for the Scriptural doctrine of Christ's headship, and for their own right and duty to follow out all that is involved in it, and all that either directly or by consequence re-

sults from it, are identifying themselves with Christ, and are upon this ground virtually claiming infallibility, and demanding implicit submission.

Let the Duke of Argyll contemplate the Free Church case as bearing upon the duty of a Church of Christ, not in detached portions, but in its amplitude and totality,—let him attend to the true logical relations of the different parts of which the argument consists,—let him distinguish between what is strictly and properly argumentative, and what is fitted to illustrate the importance and solemnity of the points involved in the argument, and to enforce the discharge of practical duty in regard to them, and then we think he will be satisfied that this objection is utterly groundless.

5. The Duke, while charging Scottish Presbyterians in general with an irrelevant and illogical application of Scripture in defending their peculiar opinions, tries to show that Free Churchmen have surpassed all their predecessors in the extravagance and fanaticism which they have manifested in this respect. Nothing but the most extraordinary ignorance or inconsideration could have led his Grace to make such a charge. This has been conclusively established in a very able and effective pamphlet by the Rev. Mr. Gray, entitled, “Correspondence between the Duke of Argyll and the Rev. A. Gray, Perth,” in reference to his Grace’s Essay, entitled “Presbytery Examined.” We shall not dwell upon this topic, but refer our readers to Mr. Gray’s pamphlet, where they will find also some very valuable materials for assisting them in forming a right estimate of his Grace’s work, and of the merits of the controversy to which it chiefly relates.

The Duke of Argyll, notwithstanding the ability which he has brought to the task, has, we think, utterly failed in obscuring the import, or in depreciating the value, of the testimony of the Church of Scotland to the independence of the Church of Christ and its exemption from civil control, as connected with the doctrine of His sole headship over it, or in producing anything fitted to shake the confidence of intelligent Free Churchmen in the Scriptural truth and practical importance of the principles which they have been called upon to maintain. It is easy enough, in surveying the ecclesiastical history of Scotland, to point out traces of human imperfection and infirmity, but it is not easy to show that Scottish Presbyterians did not thoroughly understand the great principles for which they were so signally honoured to contend, or that they were not able to defend them from Scripture and reason against all who might assail them. It is easy enough to excite a prejudice in the minds of English readers against the principles of the Free Church, and against the men who have advocated and applied them, but

it is not easy to show that these principles involve anything inconsistent either with the particular statements or the general doctrines of the Word of God, or that, in their substance, they have not the countenance and support of almost all the Churches of Christ, and of the great body of those whose testimony is entitled to the highest respect. The Duke seems to affect the character of an Eclectic in his ecclesiastical views, but we doubt much whether he is yet altogether qualified to sustain this position with credit and advantage. He can scarcely be said to have any definite well-digested system of opinions on the subjects which he discusses. He rather criticises all other systems, and selects from them what suits his taste, without much regard to the unity or harmony of the combination. He can scarcely remain long in his present position, or continue to adhere to all the views which he now supports on ecclesiastical questions, and we greatly fear that the probability is in favour of his changing for the worse, of his deviating still farther than he now does from the paths of truth and sound doctrine. He still professes himself a Presbyterian, but we fear that he will land at length, like the great body of our Scottish aristocracy, in the Church of England. He is evidently prepared for at least tolerating almost any amount of Erastian interference by the civil power in the regulation of the Church's affairs. He sees nothing objectionable, but, on the contrary, evidence of enlarged wisdom, in the introduction of the inventions of men into the worship of God; and he has already become familiar with the dangerous and delusive process of explaining away or evading the testimony of Scripture on all subjects on which its decisions are not direct, formal, and explicit. In these circumstances we see little or nothing to protect his Grace from the influence of those outward and inferior considerations which have led so many of the Scottish nobility to adhere to the English Establishment. He seems at present to be much in the same undecided and perilous position which his illustrious ancestor occupied during the earlier sittings of the Glasgow Assembly of 1638, but we scarcely venture to expect in this case an equally noble and magnanimous decision. And yet we would very willingly cherish the hope that one who is the descendant and representative of the illustrious men that did and suffered so much for the cause of civil and religious liberty in Scotland, and contended so nobly for those great principles, the maintenance of which forms the distinguishing glory of Scottish Presbyterians, and who himself possesses no ordinary personal claims to the admiration and respect of his countrymen, may yet attain to more clear and Scriptural views of the relations and duties of Churches and nations, and be honoured to contribute largely by his talents and influence to diffuse these views

in the community, and to promote their practical application. May the Lord give him understanding in all things.

His Grace seems to have adopted to a large extent the views of Dr. Arnold in regard to the Church and its relation to the civil power, though we doubt much whether he fully understands them, and are pretty sure that he is not yet prepared to follow them out fully to their legitimate consequences. Dr. Arnold's favourite principle upon this point, was the identification of the Church and the Christian State, or in other words, a virtual denial that the Church is, by its institution, and according to Christ's appointment, a distinct and independent society, with a fixed and unchangeable constitution and government, and with settled laws for the regulation of its affairs. This is the notion which was devised by Hooker, and expounded by him in the Eighth Book of the Ecclesiastical Polity, for the purpose of sanctioning authoritative interference on the part of the State in the government of the Church, and warranting the civil power to regulate and control ecclesiastical matters, just as it does military or financial matters, or any other department of the ordinary national business. We do not suppose that the ingenious and benevolent mind of Dr. Arnold was influenced by any such motive or object in advocating that notion, but it fairly admits of being applied, and will of course be generally applied by politicians, to sanction a system of low and degrading Erastianism. The notion is so palpably inconsistent with the plainest Scriptural principles, that, notwithstanding the high authority of the "venerable" Hooker, it has never found much countenance among the clerical defenders of the Erastianism of the Church of England, who have preferred to try other shifts and expedients, in order to palliate their position, but has been taken up chiefly by worldly politicians. The only plausibility of the notion is derived from imagining what might, and probably would be the state of matters, if true Christianity pervaded the whole community, and affected the proceedings of the civil rulers and the general regulation of national affairs; and the essential fallacy of it lies in this, that it implies a total disregard and a virtual denial of all that the Scripture teaches us concerning the Church of Christ, its fixed and unalterable relation to Him and to his Word, and the perpetuity and unchangeableness of its constitution, government, and laws. Dr. Arnold defines the Church to be an association for the moral reformation of the community; and this might without impropriety enter as one feature into a detailed description that might be given of the Church, but it is not the *definition* of it furnished by Scripture. It omits everything essential and fundamental which Scripture teaches concerning the Church. It leaves out all the leading

ideas which Scripture requires us to introduce into our conception and definition of the visible Church Catholic, and all the main principles which it obliges every particular society calling itself a Church of Christ, to act upon, in the discharge of its duties, and in the regulation of its conduct. And of course it is evident that we ought to regulate our definition of the Church, and our views of its nature, constitution, government, functions, and objects, by the statements of the Word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever, and not by our own imagining: of what is possible or probable, nor even by any actual realities in the state of society that might be presented before us. Even if Dr. Arnold's idea of a Christian community and a Christian State were to be fully realized in fact, this should not in the least affect the Scriptural doctrine concerning the Church and its constitution and government, and it would afford no warrant whatever to civil rulers *as such*, to interfere authoritatively in the regulation of ecclesiastical affairs.

There seems to be a strong desire in the present day on the part of politicians to acquire for the civil power a larger measure of control over Churches, not only over those which are Established, but over those also which are unconnected with the State, in order to employ ecclesiastical influence for political purposes. And it is melancholy that such men as Dr. Arnold, the Duke of Argyll, and in some degree also the Chevalier Bunsen, should have propounded views which are fitted to encourage them in the prosecution of this object, by encouraging Churches to accept of and submit to their interference and control. The general current of opinion, however, among thinking and earnest men of all denominations, is, happily, running in the opposite direction. There is now, perhaps, more generally diffused in society than ever before, an intelligent appreciation of the true character of the Church of Christ as a distinct independent society, and of the obligation that attaches to every society calling itself a Church of Christ, to maintain its true position and character as such, to the exclusion of all civil control over its affairs, and with the forfeiture, when necessary for this end, (as it certainly is in the case of all existing ecclesiastical Establishments,) of civil advantages and emoluments. The Disruption of the Established Church of Scotland, with the prominence thereby given to the principles of Scottish Presbyterians, may be fairly regarded as one of the influences which have contributed to produce this desirable result, and we trust that this and other concordant influences, will continue to operate with increasing power, until all the Churches of Christ are wholly emancipated from civil control, and are walking "in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free."

ART. VII.—*Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell.* Edited by WILLIAM BEATTIE, M.D., one of his Executors. London, 1849.

FOR something more than half a century the custom has been gradually increasing, of publishing with but little reserve, such letters of eminent men as have been written in the ordinary management of the affairs of life, or the careless confidence of domestic intimacy. In Johnson's "*Lives of the Poets*," we scarcely remember a single private letter being printed as illustrating any one statement in the work, or as affording an exhibition of the character of any one of the writers, whose lives he relates. A short time before the publication of "*The Lives of the Poets*," Mason had, in his *Memoirs of Gray*, introduced a new style of biography which has affected, more or less, every work of the kind since written. The journals of Gray, a retired scholar, who took accurate notes of whatever he read, supplied much that was instructive and interesting to the earnest student; and Mason had the opportunity of selecting, from a correspondence conducted through the whole of Gray's life with one friend or another, a vast body of information, on a great variety of subjects. There were few personal details; and though Mason made great use of Gray's letters, yet there was scarcely a single letter published without omissions. The example given by Mason, was followed in two remarkable instances by a writer whose poetry was once popular, and whose prose works, in spite of great affectation, which deforms everything he has written, are still very pleasing. Hayley, in his *Life of Milton*, has woven together passages from Milton's letters, calculated to make his readers sympathize with the great poet, and which give a wholly different aspect to his life from that which the readers of Johnson had received. Milton's minor poems had been published by Thomas Warton, with notes, curiously illustrative of the mental process by which Milton's poetical language was elaborated; but in those notes, and through the whole book, Milton's controversial writings were assailed in a temper of bigotry scarcely intelligible in our days, and which Hayley's "*Life*" did much to counteract. To an extent which is quite surprising, he was enabled to effect what Michelet and others have done in the case of Luther, and thus Milton became his own biographer.

Some years after, in his *Life of Cowper*, Hayley gave to the public the very most interesting volumes of biography that have perhaps ever been published. The state of health which sepa-

rated Cowper from the active business of life, was consistent with systematic study, and with the exertion of the poetical faculty. Cowper's residence at a distance from his relatives—the peculiar tenderness with which he was regarded—and some circumstances connected with his pecuniary affairs, created a correspondence which was the amusement, and, in some sort, the business of his life. These letters, above all comparison the most charming that have ever been published, and from which, as we best remember, every passage that it could be thought unreasonable to living persons to bring before the public, had been first removed, rendered this style of biography popular. In formal autobiography there can seldom be absent some appearance of vanity. In passages selected from letters in which the author is unconsciously writing his life, this fault is at least absent, and for the last half century rarely any eminent man has died, whose friends have not been solicited for copies of such letters as accident has left undestroyed.

It was scarce possible that the great poet, Campbell, should have escaped the common lot; and a considerable mass of his letters are now given to the public by his friend and executor Dr. Beattie. The volumes also contain some biographical notes drawn up by the poet at the request of Dr. Beattie, and though we can imagine this voluminous work improved both by compression and by omission, and though we think a more diligent inquirer, without taking very much trouble on the subject, might have given us more scenes from the London life of a man who lived so much in the eye of the public—we yet think some gratitude is due to Dr. Beattie for many of the letters in these volumes. The book will aid us in appreciating the character of a man whose works will probably for many generations continue to give delight.

Campbell was a true and a great poet; he was, what is better, a true-hearted generous-minded and honourable man.

With all men life is a struggle. With such a man as Campbell—peculiarly sensitive—the struggle was from adverse circumstances more than ordinarily severe. He was the youngest of ten children. The father of the poet, Alexander Campbell, had for many years been a prosperous merchant in the Virginia trade. During the earlier part of his life he had lived at Falmouth in Virginia. He had come to the sober age of forty-five when he married Margaret Campbell, the sister of his partner in business. We will not follow Dr. Beattie in disentangling the intricate pedigree of the Campbells. Margaret was, it seems, of the same clan, but not a blood-relation, of "the Campbells of Kirnan," to which family her husband belonged. "The Campbells of Kirnan," a locality with which the poet's people

were connected by their traditions, and not by the fact of having ever resided there, was a sound that had its magic; and the mother of the poet would, late in life, when sending home an article from a shop, describe herself as Mrs. "Campbell of Kirnan," mother "of the author of the Pleasures of Hope." The Union with England had opened the American trade to Scotland. Previously to that, Scotland could only deal with the colonies of England on the footing of a foreign nation. When the trade was once opened, the industry and intelligence of the Glasgow merchants gave them almost a monopoly of the business. The war with America drove trade into other channels; and among the houses ruined by the change was that of which the poet's father was the senior partner. The savings of forty years of industry, amounting to about twenty thousand pounds, were swept away in an hour. The old man was sixty-five, too old to commence a new score with the world. His eldest child was a daughter of nineteen. The poet, if we read dates aright, was not born for two years after his father's business had been broken up.

It would appear that the debts of the firm were paid, and that a small surplus remained. In addition to this, Mr. Campbell received a small annual sum from the Merchants' Society, and from a provident institution, of which he had long been a member. This was no doubt a very different amount of income from what he had enjoyed. His wife was a sensible woman, who instantly acted on the changed state of circumstances—lived with the most severe economy, and did what she could to educate her family. The floating traditions which Dr. Beattie has collected, describe her as "of slight but shapely figure, with piercing black eyes, dark hair, and well chiselled features,"—"a shrewd observer of character—warm-hearted, strongly attached to her friends, and always ready to sympathize in their misfortunes. She was often the author of substantial but unostentatious charity." One gentleman recollects being taken to see her in his boyhood when she was very old. She bought a cane for him, and amused him by her good nature in walking up and down the room, twirling it, to shew him how the young gentlemen in Edinburgh managed their canes. She had a natural taste for music; and in her old age she would to the last sing snatches of old songs—"My poor dog Tray," and "The Blind Boy," were her favourites. It was to the former air that Campbell wrote "The Harper." "It is," says Dr. Beattie, "one of the few I heard him sing in the evening of life, when for an instant the morning sun seemed again to rest on it; and it was probably the first that soothed the infant poet in his cradle, long before he attempted to lisp in rhyme."

Alexander Campbell, the poet's father, lived in social intimacy with several of the University professors. Adam Smith was his friend, and Reid baptized the poet—hence his name Thomas. When Reid sent a copy of his "Inquiry into the Human Mind" to Alexander Campbell, and heard from him the pleasure with which he read it, he said there are two men in Glasgow who understand my work—Campbell and myself.

The elder Campbell is said to have been liberal in politics. We shall not seek to determine the precise meaning in which the word is used. He was religious. The traditions of his family told of chiefs of the clan that had suffered martyrdom for the doctrines of the Church of Scotland, and his pride as well as his better feelings were interested in the cause. Family worship was then almost the universal habit of Scottish families—and the fervour of the old man's extempore prayers was such that the very expressions which he used never passed away from the minds of his children. The poet, a short time before his death, said that he "had never heard language—the English liturgy excepted—more sublime than that in which his devotional feelings at such moments found utterance."

Poetry was not among the old merchant's studies, but he loved music, and could sing a good naval song—he loved better a metaphysical wrangle or a theological dispute—and when the young poet was caught verse-making, the father was perhaps happiest, for then most did the spirit of contradiction awake, and then only was he quite sure of being right. Whatever he might think of Reid's principle of Common Sense, he could not but feel that there was something to be said for Berkeley and Locke, and in his most vehement theological discussions he would sometimes feel that the subject had slipped through his fingers, and that while the sense of positiveness remained, the very topic of the disputation had altogether vanished from his memory. Not so when young Tom's scribbled manuscript was before him. There it was—nonsense—absolute nonsense. The poor boy had to retire crest-fallen and ashamed—the father did not perhaps know that all early poetry is imitative—he thought little (and who could think much?) of the poetry of the day, the cadences of which were echoed in every line of the boy's verses—

"His soul's proud instinct sought not to enjoy
Romantic fictions, like a minstrel boy;
Truth, standing on her solid square, from youth
He worshipped—stern uncompromising truth."

The old man lived, however, to be gratified by the reception of "The Pleasures of Hope." Had Mr. Campbell been able to get rid of the anxieties of property, when he was compelled to

retire from business, he would have been comparatively a happy man; but the restless ghost of his former prosperity haunted him for the rest of life in a series of never ending lawsuits. A correspondent of Dr. Beattie's tells us, that in the year 1790 he passed an evening at Mr. Campbell's.

"The old gentleman, who had been a great foreign merchant, was seated in his arm-chair, and dressed in a suit of the same snuff-brown cloth, all from the same web. There were present besides Thomas, his brother Daniel, and two sisters, Elizabeth and Isabella. The father then at the age of eighty, spoke only once to us. It was when one of his sons, Thomas I think, who was then about thirteen, and of my own age, was speaking of getting new clothes, and descanting in grave earnest as to the most fashionable colours. Tom was partial to green, I preferred blue. 'Lads,' said the senior, in a voice that fixed our attention, 'if you wish to have a lasting suit, get one like mine.' We thought he meant one of a snuff-brown colour; but he added, 'I have a *suit* in the Court of Chancery, which has lasted thirty years; and I think it will never wear out.'"

Situations were found for the elder sons in the colonies. They ended in forming respectable mercantile establishments in Virginia and Demerara. The daughters engaged in the education of children—two as governesses in families, the third in the management of a school. Daniel was placed in a Glasgow manufactory, where weaving and cotton-spinning were conducted on a large scale. He was a politician, and the days in which he lived were less prosperous times for a radical reformer than our own. He found Scotland too hot for him, and went to Rouen, where the poet found him conducting a large manufactory. He ceased to correspond with his family, and became a naturalized Frenchman. It is not impossible that he may be still living. Of this large family, one died in early life; he was drowned while bathing in the Clyde, when he was but thirteen years old, and his brother Thomas six. He is alluded to in an affecting passage towards the close of "The Pleasures of Hope"—

"Weep not—at Nature's transient pain,
Congenial spirits part to meet again.

* * * *

Inspiring thought of rapture yet to be,
The tears of love were hopeless but for thee.
If in that frame no deathless spirit dwell,
If that faint murmur be the last farewell,
If Fate unite the faithful but to part,
Why is their memory sacred to the heart?
Why does the brother of my childhood seem
Restored awhile in every pleasing dream?

Why do I joy the lonely spot to view
By artless friendship bless'd, when life was new?"

The elder part of the family had been dispersed during the early infancy of the poet, or before his birth. The father's temper was indulgent to everything but poetry, and his affections were centred on the child of his old age. The mother's temper was severe, and her notions of a parent's rights were almost as high as a Stuart's fancies of the royal prerogative, yet it was observed that her natural asperity relaxed in the management of her youngest son. Mary, the eldest sister, had already left her father's house; Isabella still remained to assist her mother in domestic details, and with her the playful child was a delightful plaything. The poet has in his letters called Isabella his poetical sister, and from her or from his mother his ear had become familiar with the ballad poetry of Scotland long before he could understand its meaning.

At eight years old he was sent to the school of Mr. Alison: his triumphs are solemnly recorded—he was always at the head of his class; his father assisted him in preparing his lessons—a fact commemorated by his classical biographer in language that swells into dignity suitable to the subject. "It must have been," says he, "a picture in itself of no little beauty and interest, to see the venerable Nestor stooping over the versions and directing the studies of the future Tyrtæus."

The boy was overworked, and was obliged to be sent to the country. In about six weeks his health was restored, but to the effect of running wild about the fields his biographer refers his love of the country, and much of the imagery of his poems. About this time his first verses were written. Of these and of his school exercises, Dr. Beattie gives us far too many. Translations of Anacreon, and thefts of strawberries distinguish his twelfth year. In the thirteenth, young Tyrtæus learned to throw stones, and gave—in plain prose—what turned out to be a very poetical or very fabulous account of the battle. The inspired boy was not unlikely to be spoiled by the young Glasgow blackguards, who with every care on the part of his parents could not but be his companions for a considerable part of the day.

Of brother Daniel our readers are probably prepared not to think very well—he was four years older than Thomas, and was now sixteen or seventeen. An old lady—a relative of their mother's—lived about two miles from Glasgow, and one of the boys was each day sent to know how she was. It was Thomas's turn, and the message to the old lady's interfered with the young urchin's gathering blackberries. "Why go there at all," said Daniel; "can't you do as I do—say she is better, or worse, and don't

take the trouble of going to inquire." For weeks and for months the young scoundrels went on with fictitious bulletins, and finding that unfavourable reports were likely to make more frequent messages sent, they adopted a form that "Mrs. Simpson had a better night and was going on nicely." They at last announced her perfect recovery, and were starting on some expedition of their own when a letter arrived "as broad and as long as a brick, with cross-bones and a grinning death's head on its seal," inviting the old gentleman to attend Mrs. Simpson's funeral.

"Mr. and Mrs. Campbell looked at the letter, then at their two hopeful sons, and then at one another. But such were their grief and astonishment that neither of them could utter a word. 'At last,' says the poet, 'my mother's grief for her cousin vented itself in cuffing our ears. But I was far less pained by her blows than by a few words from my father. He never raised a hand to us; and I would advise all fathers, who would have their children to love their memory, to follow his example.'"

In spite of this unpromising scene, Campbell's school-days gave promise of good. Alison, his schoolmaster, thought well of him. Mr. Stevenson, a surviving school-fellow of his, remembers him as taking care that fair play should be shewn to him, who was an English boy, and probably the only one in the school. He passed from school to college with favourable auguries. He was in his thirteenth year when he entered College, and even from this early period his support was in part earned by his teaching younger boys. At this period he printed a ballad, called *Morven and Fillan*, in imitation of a passage in *Ossian*, and which contains some lines that bear a resemblance to his after poem of *Lord Ullin's daughter*.

"Loud shrieked afar the angry sprite
That rode upon the storm of night,
And loud the waves were heard to roar
That lashed on Morven's rocky shore."

Morven and Fillan.

"By this the storm grew loud apace;
The water-wraith was shrieking."

Lord Ullin's Daughter.

Campbell and his young friends formed debating societies, and the poet seems to have been distinguished for fluency of speech. A number of Campbell's exercises are printed by Dr. Beattie, for no better reason than that "they may revive the faded images of college life" in the minds of Campbell's few surviving college friends. Lines on the death of "Marie Antoinette" are given. They are perhaps worth preserving, as

they show how early the poet's ear was tuned to something of the notes in which his *Hohenlinden* was afterwards written.

The third session of Campbell's college life was distinguished by his continuing to take the lead in debating societies, and in his obtaining prizes for composition. He wrote a number of pasquinades on his brother students. They were written without any other feeling than that of amusing himself and others, but they were not disregarded by those who were their objects. Dr. Beattie tells that in some cases the resentment generated by satires written at this time, and utterly forgotten by Campbell in the hour in which they were thrown off as mere sportive effusions, has absolutely survived the poet himself.

Some of Campbell's jokes were for the purpose of getting a place near the stove when attending the logic class on a winter morning. He would scratch some nonsense on the walls—a libel, perhaps, on the tall Irish students that crowded round the fire. While they rushed to read such rhymes as

*" Vos Hiberni collocatis
Summum Bonum in potatoes,"*

he managed to get to the stove. "

Campbell was at this time an ardent politician. The French Revolution had everywhere evoked the contending spirits of Aristocracy and Democracy.

"Being," says Campbell, "in my own opinion a competent judge of politics, I became a democrat. I read Burke on the French Revolution, of course; but unable to follow his subtleties or to appreciate his merits, I took the word of my brother democrats, that he was a sophist. It was in those years that the Scottish reformers, Muir, Gerald, and others, were transported to Botany Bay—Muir, though he had never uttered a sentence in favour of reform stronger than William Pitt himself had uttered, and Gerald for acts which, in the opinion of sound English lawyers, fell short of sedition. I did not even then approve of Gerald's mode of agitating the reform question in Scotland by means of a Scottish convention; but I had heard a magnificent account of his talents and accomplishments, and I longed insufferably to see him; but the question was how to get to Edinburgh.

"While thus gravely considering the ways and means, it immediately occurred to me that I had an uncle's widow in Edinburgh—a kind, elderly lady, who had seen me at Glasgow, and said that she would be glad to receive me at her house if I should ever come to the Scottish metropolis. I watched my mother's *mollia tempora fandi*—for she had them, good woman—and eagerly catching the propitious moment, I said—'O mamma, how I long to see Edinburgh. If I had but three shillings, I could walk there in one day, sleep two nights, and be two days at my aunt Campbell's, and walk back in another'

day.* To my delightful surprise she answered—'No, my bairn; I will give you what will carry you to Edinburgh and bring you back, but you must promise me not to walk more than half the way in any one day.' That was twenty-two miles. 'Here,' said she, 'are five shillings for you in all: two will serve you to go, and two to return; for a bed at the half-way house costs but sixpence.' She then gave me—I never shall forget the beautiful coin—a King William and Mary crown-piece. I was dumb with gratitude; but sallying out to the streets, I saw at the first bookseller's shop a print of Elijah fed by ravens. Now, I had often heard my poor mother saying that in case of my father's death—and he was a very old man—she knew not what would become of her. 'But,' she used to add, 'let me not despair, for Elijah was fed by ravens.' When I presented her with the picture, I said nothing of its tacit allusion to the possibility of my being one day her supporter; but she was much affected, and evidently felt a strong presentiment.

"Next morning I took my way to Edinburgh, with four shillings and sixpence in my pocket. I witnessed Joseph Gerald's trial, and it was an era in my life. Hitherto I had never known what public eloquence was; and I am sure the Justiciary Scotch Lords did not help to a conception of it, speaking as they did bad arguments in broad Scotch. But the Lord Advocate's speech was good; the speeches of Laing and Gillies were better; and Gerald's speech annihilated the remembrance of all the eloquence that had ever been heard within the walls of that house. He quieted the judges, in spite of their indecent interruptions of him, and produced a silence in which you might have heard a pin fall to the ground. At the close of his defence, he said—'And now, gentlemen of the jury—now that I have to take leave of you for ever, let me remind you that mercy is no small part of the duty of jurymen; that the man who shuts his heart on the claims of the unfortunate, on him the gates of mercy will be shut, and for him the Saviour of the world shall have died in vain.' At this finish I was moved, and, turning to a stranger who sat beside me, apparently a tradesman, I said to him, 'By heavens, sir, that is a great man!' 'Yes, sir,' he answered, 'he is not only a great man himself, but he makes every other man feel great who listens to him.'"

Political passion is contagious; and Campbell returned from Edinburgh an altered man—if the expression may be used in speaking of a boy of sixteen. "His characteristic sprightliness had evaporated." He did not neglect the studies of his class, but his heart was elsewhere; and his attention was divided between the "Clouds" of Aristophanes, of which he meditated a translation, and the democratic journals of the day. The case of Muir and Gerald was one singularly fitted as a topic for

* A distance of forty-two miles—"long Scotch miles."

debating clubs, for the men were transported, under the laws of Scotland, for an offence which, at that time, was in England punishable only by fine and imprisonment. Campbell vehemently denounced the conduct of the State trials in his debating clubs, and in private society exhibited the manner of one "who suffered some personal wrong which he could neither forgive nor effectually resent." His change of manner was so sudden—the violence of his indignation was such—his declamation against modern society and all its institutions was so unceasing—that there seems to have been among his friends an impression of his actually having become insane; and it was not till the demon of poetry entirely possessed him that they felt wholly free from this fear. His translation of scenes from the "Clouds" of Aristophanes was rewarded with a prize, and with the more gratifying acknowledgment from Professor Young of his version being the very best of any that had ever been given in by any student at the University. An essay on the Origin of Evil, which obtained a prize at the same time, is a skillful imitation of Pope's manner. In the course of the next session he translated some Choruses from the *Medea* of Euripides and the *Chæphori* of Æschylus. Dr. Beattie boldly says that the passages from Euripides "hardly lost anything of their original beauty by his translation." They gave more pleasure to the Professors at Glasgow than they have given to us: and Campbell, compelled to look round him for bread, found recommendations for the office of private tutor to a family of his own name residing in the remote Hebrides.

The poet's solemnity seems to have relaxed about this time. He thought less of politics, and was up to a piece of fun. A respectable apothecary, named Fife, had over his door in the Trongate, printed in large letters, "Ears Pierced by A FIFE," meaning the operation to which young ladies submit for the sake of wearing ear-rings. Fife's next door neighbour was a spirit-dealer of the name of DRUM. Campbell and his brother Daniel, assisted by a third party, who we believe is still living, got a long thin deal-board, and painted on it, in capitals—

THE SPIRIT-STIRRING DRUM—THE EAR-PIERCING FIFE.

This they nailed one night over the contiguous doors, to the great annoyance of Drum and Fife, and to the great amusement of every one else in Glasgow. In a few days afterwards Campbell set off for Mull.

From the first Campbell was thrown on his own resources for support. At thirteen or fourteen years of age, his means of paying his class-fees depended on his obtaining employment as a teacher of younger children; for surely, at that age, it is scarce

fit to call him by any other name. The genial life of childhood or boyhood never was his in the sense in which it is that of almost every person in the rank of life in which Campbell early took his natural and rightful position. We think that this forced and premature exertion of his faculties dwarfed his intellectual powers—that the perpetual excitement in which he was kept by his debating societies, and his competition for college prizes, could not but be injurious—and that it was above all things fortunate when he was separated from Glasgow, and forced into the solitudes of the Hebrides. His prize-verses had been the subject of such admiration that he ran the chance of being spoiled for ever; and nothing less than a separation from Glasgow and its coteries could have saved him. On the 18th of May 1795, he started from Glasgow, in company with a class-fellow, Joseph Finlayson, and took the road to Inverary. Wordsworth, in a note to the *Excursion*, vindicating his choice of a pedlar as the hero of his poem, quotes a passage from Heron's *Letters from Scotland*, in which he says—"A young man going from any part of Scotland to England, of purpose to *carry the pack*, was considered as going to lead the life and acquire the fortune of a gentleman." Poor Campbell, carrying his store of learning to the Hebrides, did not feel the same elevation of spirit, when he thought of the value likely to be set on the articles in which he dealt. "I was fain," he says, "from my father's reduced circumstances, to accept, for six months, of a tutorship in a Highland family at the farthest end of the Isle of Mull. To this, it is true, my poverty rather than my will consented. I was so little proud of it, that in passing through Greenock, I purposely omitted to call on my mother's cousin, Mr. Robert Sinclair, at that time a wealthy merchant, and first magistrate of the town, with a family of nine daughters, one of whom I married some nine years afterwards." He would not tell his pretty cousins he was going out in that capacity. He tells of an evening past in the open air for the sake of economy. When he and Finlayson were repairing dinnerless to their beds, they saved the life of a boy who was drowning, and then thought they earned a fair right to their dinner. The poet tells of beef-steaks vanishing before them "like smoke;"—then came tankards of ale—and then a night past in singing and reciting poetry.

"Life," says Campbell, speaking of this scene, "is happier in the transition than in the retrospect, but still I am bound to regard this part of my recollections of life as very agreeable. I was, it is true, very poor, but I was as gay as a lark and hardy as the Highland heather." We wish we had room for Campbell's account of this journey. "The wide world contained not two merrier boys. We sang and recited poetry throughout the

long wild Highland glens." They believed in Ossian, and Ossian had given an interest to the Gaelic people in their eyes. The Highland inns gave them herrings, potatoes, and whisky, and nothing else. Their walk seems to have been in glorious weather. Full forty years afterwards, when Campbell wrote of it, he tells of his unmeasured delight at the roaring streams and torrents—the yellow primroses and the cuckoos—the heathy mountains, with the sound of the goats' bleating at their tops. "I felt a soul in every muscle of my body, and my mind was satisfied that I was going to earn my bread by my own labour."

They met a boy, in a postman's dress, quietly playing marbles on the road-side. "You little rascal," we said to him, "are you the post-boy and thus playing away your time?" "Na, sir," answered Red-jacket, "I'm no the post; I'm only an express!" At Inverary he and Finlayson parted company, and Campbell walked alone to Oban, under drenching rain. From Oban he crossed over to Mull.

"In the course of a long summer's day I traversed the whole length of the island—which must be nearly thirty miles—with not a foot-path to direct me. At times I lost all traces of my way, and had no guide but the sun going westward. About twilight, however, I reached the Point Calloch,* the house of my hostess, Mrs. Campbell, of Sunipol—a worthy sensible widow lady, who treated me with great kindness. I am sure I made a conscience of my duty towards my pupils. I never beat them—remembering how much I loved my father for having never beaten me.

"At first I felt melancholy in this situation, missing my college chums, and wrote a poem on my exile as doleful as any thing in Ovid's *Tristia*. But I soon got reconciled to it. The Point of Calloch commands a magnificent prospect of thirteen Hebridean islands, among which are Staffa and Icolmkill, which I visited with enthusiasm. I had also, now and then, a sight of wild deer, sweeping across that wilder country, and of eagles perching on its shore. These objects fed the romance of my fancy, and I may say that I was attached to Sunipol before I took leave of it. Nevertheless, God wot, I was better pleased to look on the kirk steeples and whinstone causeways of Glasgow than on all the eagles and wild deer of the Highlands."

The solitude in which Campbell now lived was strangely contrasted with the busy scenes which he had left; and it must have been of great use to him to have time for actual communing with

* "The Point Calloch" is on the northern shore of Mull, where the house of Sunipol may be easily seen by any one sailing from Tobermory to Staffa. It stands quite upon the shore, and occupies the centre of a bay immediately before you turn that point of Mull where you first get a view of the wondrous island which contains the cave of Píngal.

his own mind. In spite of its eminent men there was in the whole of the Glasgow literature something of a mercantile—not to say peddling—character. It was disputative in its progress, and all progress stopped at an early stage. The exchangeable value of learning was chiefly thought of, and the great object in life was the dictatorial position of the professor's chair. By the system early proficiency and considerable accuracy of information, up to a certain not very high point, were attained; and Campbell was as near being ruined by the admiration of a little provincial circle as ever great man was, when his poverty fortunately interposed to rescue him.

It was the wisdom and the will of heaven
That in a lonely tent had cast
The lot of Thalaba;
There might his soul develop best
Its strengthening energies;
There might he from the world
Keep his heart pure and uncontaminate,
Till at the written hour he should be found
Fit servant of the Lord, without a spot.

We have no doubt that solitude is the true nursery for a great poet; and we think that the narrative of Campbell's life—both in his success and his failures—is calculated remarkably to illustrate this. In the lonely residence, where he educated a few children, there was time for thought; nay, self-reflection was strangely forced on him, for the box containing his books did not arrive for some time, and till it arrived he was even without paper. A letter of his, dated June 1795, tells a friend of his that "there is no paper in Mull." To have passed some time in thinking instead of writing, would have been no bad discipline for a young prize-poet. Campbell would write, however, as much as he could, and he scribbled as much as he could on a white-washed wall. By the time pen, ink, and paper arrived, the wall appeared like a broad-sheet of manuscript.

Of Campbell's verses before he left Glasgow, the only ones at all worthy of preservation are a hymn, most of which was afterwards worked into the *Pleasures of Hope*. While in Mull he employed himself in adding to his translations from Æschylus and Aristophanes, probably thinking that a character for scholarship was more likely to lead to some provision by which he might support life, than any exertion in the way of original poetry. Dr. Beattie, however, gives us some lines descriptive of the scenery of Mull, which when shown to Dr. Anderson two years afterwards, led him to predict Campbell's future success as a poet. The lines are well worth preserving:—

ELEGY WRITTEN IN MULL.

The tempest blackens on the dusky moor,
And billows lash the long-resounding shore ;
In pensive mood I roam the desert ground,
And vainly sigh for scenes no longer found.

O whither fled the pleasurable hours
That chased each care, and fired the muse's powers ;
The classic haunts of youth for ever gay,
Where mirth and friendship cheer'd the close of day ;
The well-known valleys, where I wont to roam,
The native sports, the nameless joys of home ?

Far different scenes allure my wondering eye ;
'The white wave foaming to the distant sky—
The cloudy heavens, unblest by summer's smile—
The sounding storm, that sweeps the rugged isle—
The chill, bleak summit of eternal snow—
The wide, wild glen—the pathless plains below—
The dark blue rocks, in barren grandeur piled—
The cuckoo sighing to the pensive wild !

Far different these from all that charmed before
The grassy banks of Clutha's winding shore ;
Her sloping vales, with waving forests lined,
Her smooth blue lakes, unruffled by the wind ;—
Hail ! happy Clutha ! glad shall I survey
Thy gilded turrets from the distant way ;
Thy sight shall cheer the weary traveller's toil,
And joy shall hail me to my native soil.

June 1795.

In a letter of June 1795, one of his correspondents says to him —“ We have now three ‘Pleasures’ by first-rate men of genius, viz., ‘Imagination,’ ‘Memory,’ ‘Solitude.’ Let us cherish the ‘Pleasures of Hope,’ that we may soon meet in ‘Alma Mater.’” This is the first time that “The Pleasures of Hope” is mentioned. “The Pleasures of Solitude,” commemorated in the same sentence, are a few lines enclosed to Campbell, and written by his correspondent. That correspondent was the Rev. Hamilton Paul, afterwards and still minister at Broughton in Peebles-shire, specimens of whose poetry will be found in an interesting volume, entitled “The Contemporaries of Burns and the more recent Poets of Ayrshire.” *

Through all Campbell's poetry we find the traces of this residence in the Hebrides. The effect is well described and illustrated by Dr. Beattie, whose own account of Highland scenery

* Edinburgh, 1840.

is quite admirable. But for this we can only refer to the book, as within the space to which we must limit our paper, it is quite impossible to give any lengthened quotation. Campbell himself describes Iona and Staffa in one or two letters, but there is nothing peculiar in his account—and we think Dr. Beattie might have not unwisely omitted or greatly abridged these letters. Of the superstitions of the people an amusing instance is given, of which the poet was himself the hero and the historian:—

“A mile or two from the house where I lived, was a burial-ground on the lonely moor. It was enclosed with an iron railing, so high as to be thought unscaleable. I contrived, by help of my handkerchief, to scale the railing, and was soon scampering over the tombs. Some of the natives chanced to see me skipping over the burial-ground. In a day or two after this adventure, I observed the family looking on me with an expression of not angry but mournful seriousness. It was to me unaccountable; but at last the old grandmother told me, with tears in her eyes, that I could not live long, for that my *wraith*, or apparition, had been seen. ‘And where, pray?’ ‘Oh, leaping over the old burial-ground!’ The good old lady was much relieved by hearing that it was not my *wraith* but myself.”

Dr. Beattie had inquiries made at Mull as to any recollections of the poet that might linger there. Nothing was remembered but that he was “a pretty young man.” Some local tradition also exists there, that the heroine of his poem, Caroline, was some fair Caroline of that district, and to this opinion his biographer inclines, though he tells us of another Caroline that claims the same distinction. Goethe got into a serious scrape, by transcribing the same love verses into the album of more than one young lady; but we have no evidence that Campbell gave either lady any reason to think that she was the source of his inspiration. We suspect that the Carolines and the Marias of the poets have no earthly representatives—that the golden locks which the poet describes are not in general to be regarded as proving his admiration of red-haired beauties, but rather as his form of escaping from the plain realities of earth—that when we find the place of his residence is in a prose letter described as “only fit for the residence of the damned,” and verses of the same date, such as follow:—

Oh, gentle gale of Eden bowers,
If back thy rosy feet should roam
To revel with the cloudless hours
In Nature's more propitious home,
Name to thy loved Elysian groves,
That o'er enchanted spirits twine,
A fairer form than Cherub loves,
And let that name be Caroline.

The lady, in such verses, seems to us as unreal as the landscape; and we regret to say, that the poem called *Caroline*, though for a considerable time not printed in any of the poet's own editions of his works, has been introduced into the last. It is, we think, wholly unworthy of the poet's reputation.

In the winter of 1796 he returned to Glasgow, to continue attending his classes, and to support himself by private tuition. Among his pupils in this and a former session was one who is described in Campbell's journals, "as a youth named Cuninghame, now Lord Cuninghame in the Justiciary Court of Edinburgh. Grave as he now is, he was, when I taught him 'Xenophon and Lucian,' a fine laughing, open-hearted boy, and so near my own age, that we were rather like play-fellows than preceptor and pupil. Sometimes, indeed, I used to belabour him—jocosely alleging my sacred duty as a tutor—but I seldom succeeded in suppressing his risibility."

Lord Cuninghame's recollections of the period are distinct. "He left on my mind, young as I was, a high impression not only of his talents as a classical scholar, but of the elevation and purity of his sentiments." He tells us, that in reading Cicero and Demosthenes, he was fond of contrasting their speeches with those of modern orators. He used to repeat Chatham's most impassioned passages in favour of American freedom, Burke's declamation against Warren Hastings, and Wilberforce's description of the "Middle Passage." In the domestic circle, consisting of Campbell's parents, sisters, and some lodgers, the elder portion of the society were deep haters of democracy and all innovation; Tom Campbell and his brother Daniel were earnest democrats.

When this session closed, Campbell again went to the Highlands as tutor; Hamilton Paul was similarly occupied in the same neighbourhood, and the friends often met. "In the course of the autumn," says Dr. Beattie, "Campbell and his friend Paul, indulged in frequent rambles along the shore of Loch Fyne. They then would climb some rocky precipice to enjoy the landscape at ease, and afterwards enjoy a frugal dinner at the Inverary Arms." We have Paul's account of their last day of this kind. They dined, by appointment, at the Inverary Arms, with two college friends. All met punctually at the inn-door. All were joyous; "but never did schoolboy enjoy an unexpected holiday more than Campbell. He danced, sang, and capered, half frantic with joy. Our friends had to return to the low country, and we accompanied them across Loch Fyne to St. Katharine's, where we parted; they taking their way to Lochgilphead, while Campbell and I promenaded the shore of the loch to Strachur. The evening sun was just setting behind the Gram-

pians. The wood-fringed shores of the lake—the sylvan scenes around the castle of Inverary—the sun-lit summits of the mountains in the distance—all were inspiring. Thomas was in ecstasy. He recited poetry of his own composition—some of which has never been printed—and then addressed me—“Paul, you and I must go in search of adventures,—you will be Roderick Random, and I will go through the world with you as Strap.” At Strachur they parted, not without visiting the inn there, and taking a bowl of punch with the landlord. “We parted with much regret. We never saw each other again, until we met at the great public dinner given to him as Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow.”

Campbell’s letters, from what he calls “The solitary nook,” in which he lived, are dreary enough. They have also the misfortune of being the letters of a man whose time hangs heavy on his hands, and who is always complaining that friends who have demands on their time are not as active correspondents as he could wish. His cause of complaint with the world seems his own inaction. “The present moments,” he says, “are of little importance to me. I must expect all my pleasure and pain from the remembrance of the past, and the anticipation of the future.” * * * I have neat pocket copies of Virgil and Horace, affluence of English poets, a rod and flute, and a choice collection of Scotch and Irish airs.” It would appear that he read diligently for a while, with some hope of making his way to the bar, and afterwards, when want of funds rendered this out of the question, with some view of becoming an attorney, or earning his bread in an attorney’s office.

The young poet was in love; and he tells of the enchantment of his evening walks, accompanied by one who “for a twelve-month past has won my purest but most ardent affection:

“Dear precious name—rest ever unrevealed,
Nor pass these lips, in holy silence sealed.”

He speaks of sending his friend some lately written morsels of poetry. In fact, “The Pleasures of Hope,” playfully alluded to by Hamilton Paul in a letter of the year before, was now seriously commenced.

The Reverend Mr. Wright, Campbell’s successor at Downie; has supplied Dr. Beattie with some account of the scenery of this part of the Western Highlands, and of the poet’s habits. Everything recorded proves what we have before suggested, that all the elements of Campbell’s poetical life were at this time formed, indeed almost all the subjects which afterwards appeared in succession, and after a late manifestation, were here first presented to his kindling fancy. In the *Pilgrim of Glencoe*, his

last poem of any length, the very house in which he lived is described.

The "*Jacobite white rose*" festooned their door, and the inmates

"All had that peculiar courtly grace,
That marks the meanest of the Highland race;
Warm hearts, that burn alike in weal or wo,
As if the north-wind fanned their bosom's glow."

From a hill above the farm-house, which was his residence at Downie, and which was the poet's constant place of resort, "the eye looks down towards the beach where considerable masses of rock bar all access to the coast; while the vast expanse of the Sound of Jura, with all its varying aspects of tempest and of calm, stretches directly in front of the spectator. The island of Jura forms the boundary of the opposite coast. Far southwards the sea opens in broader expanse towards the northern shores of Ireland, which, in certain states of the atmosphere, may be faintly descried. Northward, at a much shorter distance, is the whirlpool of Corrieveekeen, whose mysterious noises may be heard occasionally along the coast." The pictures in Gertrude of the scenery, calculated to affect the Highland quigrant's imagination, were no doubt suggested by what the poet was fond of beholding at this period of his life.

"But who is he that yet a dearer land
Remembers over hills and far away?
Green Albin, what though he no more survey
Thy ships at anchor on her quiet shore,
Thy pellochs rolling from the mountain bay,
Thy lone sepulchral cairn upon the moor,
And distant isles that hear the loud Corbrechtan roar?
Alas! poor Caledonia's mountaineer
That want's stern edict e'er and feudal grief
Hud forced him from a home he loved so dear!"

It would appear that Campbell's youthful passion was the cause of his leaving Downie. He felt that the business of tuition was insufficient for more than his own support in the very humblest form, and he returned to his father's house. The aspect of things was unchanged there. Letters of mixed good and ill had arrived telling of the fortunes of the members of the family who had found a home in Virginia, and Thomas thought of going thither to share their fortunes. His love-dream interfered with this; his health too was breaking. He had lived too much alone—he had laboured too hard at his studies—he had in spirit fought too many battles with the world, which he thought wronged him even by the fact of not knowing of his existence—he had with the pardonable pride of the poor, imagined intended insult in every word addressed to him by those whom he called aristo-

crats, and the mind itself seemed likely to be wrecked in the sort of excitement in which he lived—“eating his own heart,” doing infinite wrong in imagination to everybody and everything of which he thought, and resenting in the very depths of his nature injuries that he had never suffered. He absolutely saw nothing in its true aspect, and if fever had not supervened, and thus diverted the current of his thoughts, the case must have ended in madness. The injustice which he did the world it is probable never occurred to him. At this very time the greater part of the poem, which was to place him among the great men of England, had been already written. So far from there being any indisposition at any period to acknowledge his merits, they had from the first hour of his connexion with the University of Glasgow, been rapturously hailed both by professors and students. The only means that the University had of serving him was taken from them by his determination not to continue engaged in the education of pupils, nor to take orders in the Church. To the first he had an invincible repugnance, and though “the deep-seated impressions of religion which he had received under his father’s roof,” resumed their sway over his mind in after-life, yet he had at this period adopted opinions incompatible with his taking orders.

When he recovered from fever he went to Edinburgh, and was for a while employed as a copying clerk in an attorney’s office, and seems to have thought himself entitled to discourse on the morality of the profession. His earnings seem to have been but a few pence a day, and he left the business—not of attorney, but of mere writing-clerk—with this sounding diatribe: “Well, I have fairly tried the business of an *attorney*, and upon my conscience, it is the most accursed of all professions! such meanness—such toil—such contemptible modes of speculation—were never moulded into one profession. It is true there are many emoluments, but I declare to God that I can hardly spend, with a safe conscience, the little sum I made during my residence in Edinburgh.” He was fortunately introduced to Dr. Anderson, the editor of the *British Poets*—an exceedingly amiable man, and who, if we may judge by the numberless dedications of volumes of poems to him, was the general patron of any unfriended persons of whose talents he thought favourably. Anderson made out among the booksellers some employment for him, and he was engaged to abridge Bryan Edwards’s *West Indies*—his first dealing with the printer’s devil.

His earliest published poem, “The Wounded Hussar,” was produced at this time, and to this period Dr. Beattie refers “The Dirge of Wallace,” which we thought had been written at Altona, some two or three years later. This poem has been

reprinted in the American editions of Campbell, but was never admitted into any edition authorized by the poet. Beattie was, therefore, right in printing it. It is quite unequal to Campbell's usual style. There is a boyish accumulation of the stock imagery of "The Tales of Wonder." Ravens, nightmares, matin-bells, and midnight tapers, are scattered in waste profusion over the opening of the poem, to the consternation of the English king and the affright of Wallace's wife—nothing can well be worse than all this. What follows is better, and there are some lines worthy of Campbell.

" Yet knew not his country that ominous hour
That the trumpet of death on an English tower
Had the dirge of her warrior sung.

* * * *

Oh ! it was not thus when his ashen spear
Was true to that knight forlorn,
And hosts of a thousand were scatter'd like deer,
At the blast of the hunter's horn ;
When he strode o'er the wreck of each well-fought field,
With the yellow-hair'd chiefs of his native land ;
For his lance was not shivered on helmet or shield,
And the sword that was fit for archangel to wield
Was light in his terrible hand.

The habits of life at this period, both in the Highlands and at Glasgow, were unfavourable to temperance. In wild districts where there were few inns, the virtue of hospitality required every gentleman to throw his house freely open, and to detain as long as possible whatever guest might arrive. At Edinburgh and Glasgow men drank till day-break; in the Highlands the sun was shut out till long after mid-day. At college the Glasgow students never met at each other's rooms without " a third companion, in the shape of a black bottle, that exercised no little influence on their discussions." Campbell admired the Celtic character, and was everywhere a welcome guest. Campbell was a diligent student and of social temperament; he lived amid strong temptations, which he is described as resisting firmly. Dr. Beattie, relating this part of his life, tells us that he lived temperately, and that he was uniformly simple and spare in his diet.

In the next year he migrated to Edinburgh, to seek such bread as it could give to a man of letters. His abridgment of Bryan Edwards was ready for the press. He had received his twenty guineas—the first-fruits of the poor trade in which he was about to embark—and he looked for another commission from the publisher. His mornings he proposed to give to attendance on College lectures, and his evenings to the book-

sellers. A letter of his, written soon after, says—"I have the prospect of employment sufficient for this winter. Beyond that period I dare not hope."

His winter's work for the booksellers was compiling extracts from books of travels for a grammar of geography, "by a society of gentlemen;" hard work, and it gave him a chest complaint, which soon disenabled him to make any further exertions in this way. The hope of joining his brothers in America was again indulged and again disappointed. He now attended pupils and taught Greek and Latin. "In this," he says, "I made a comfortable livelihood, till 'The Pleasures of Hope' came over me. I took long walks about Arthur's Seat, coming over my own (as I thought them) magnificent lines; and as my 'Pleasures of Hope' got on, my pupils fell off." At this time he had already formed the acquaintance of Jeffrey and Brown. With Lord Brougham he was also acquainted. He had relatives in Edinburgh, and his parents joined him in the course of the year.

Dr. Beattie gives an interesting account of the circumstances under which "The Pleasures of Hope" was first published. Anderson succeeded in obtaining for the copyright sixty pounds, and about two hundred copies of the poem, for which Campbell found friends to subscribe. The copyright must have been very profitable to the booksellers, but we are not sure that what was given was as inadequate a price as Campbell afterwards thought. He made some additions to the poem when it came to be reprinted, for which the publishers gave him fifty pounds on each edition of a thousand copies, and they once, at least, allowed him to print a subscription edition for his own exclusive benefit. On the whole we think they dealt liberally with him. At Dr. Anderson's Campbell became acquainted with Leyden. Leyden and he soon disagreed. They were both disputative; they were both strugglers for bread; and both were seeking distinction in the same circle, and through very much the same means. Leyden's own conduct was often such as to suggest doubts of his sanity, and he seems to have really thought Campbell insane. A story had been circulated in Edinburgh society that Campbell was about to commit suicide, when Anderson met him, diverted him from his purpose, and made arrangements for the publication of "The Pleasures of Hope." Campbell denied the truth of the story, and believed Leyden to have been the inventor of it, and hence arose between them an irreconcilable feud. Some years afterwards Sir Walter Scott, who had been first introduced to Campbell by Leyden, repeated to him the poem of "Hohenlinden." "Dash it man," said Leyden, "tell the fellow that I hate him; but, dash him, he has written the

finest verses that have been published these fifty years." "I," says Scott, "did mine errand as faithfully as one of Homer's messengers, and had for answer, 'Tell Leyden that I detest him; but I know the value of his critical approbation.' * * * 'When Leyden comes back from India,' said Tom Campbell, 'what cannibals he will have eaten, what tigers he will have torn to pieces.'"* That Campbell seriously meditated suicide there is no evidence—evidence abundant there is of his having exhibited such excitement of manner as to have rendered anything he might do not surprising. Mr. Somerville, landscape-painter, lived in the house where Campbell lodged; he saw some fragments of the forthcoming poem, and was astonished at seeing anything "so highly finished and dignified in tone from a youth whose demeanour was so unpretending, and whose ordinary conversation was quaint, queer, desultory, comic, occasionally querulous and sarcastic, but always the reverse of poetical." This led Somerville to watch his eccentric neighbour, and moods of "dark but very transient despondency" occasionally gave him great alarm.

"It often happened," says Somerville, "that he wandered into my room—never oftener than when he wanted 'to get away from himself.' One night, especially, he stalked in, knitting his brows, and without uttering one word, sat himself down before the fire—then, after a while, he took up the poker, and began to trace mathematical figures among the soot on the back of the chimney." In the manner of an insane man he addressed Somerville in insulting language; and, at last, the true pent-up feeling burst out. He had been working at the proofs of his poem till—whatever meaning the verses had or seemed to have—vanished away, and the whole thing appeared to him to be trash. It became torture to him to look at what he had done. "There are days," he added, "when I can't abide to walk in the sunshine, and when I would almost rather be shot than come within the sight of any man, or be spoken to by any mortal! This has been one of those days. How heartily I wished for night."

That night they supped together. We are not sure that Dr. Beattie is right in his statement that Campbell was, at this period of his life, always temperate. They sat up till after one o'clock; and at that hour there seems no probability that they separated, as Somerville says, that about that hour Campbell became wildly merry—regarded it as a settled point that his poem was to make him a great man—fixed how and where he

was to live; and his friend regarded him in all this as perfectly in earnest. "I told him," says Somerville, "that he had got a cross of the Spanish hidalgo in his character. Pride and hauteur shared largely in his composition. He would fire up at the remotest indications of an intentional slight or offence."

Never was a poem subjected to a severer ordeal than "The Pleasures of Hope," while yet in manuscript. Anderson insisted on the jealous correction of every line. The opening altogether dissatisfied him; and the publication was delayed till some happy hour of inspiration might supply something poetical enough for Anderson's scrupulous taste. His own character for discrimination was risked, as he had everywhere praised the poem; and Campbell was actually thrown into a fever by the perpetual efforts at correction imposed on him. At last the opening of the poem, as it at present stands, was hit upon. The original manuscript of the poem is now in the possession of Mr. Patrick Maxwell of Edinburgh. We trust that in future editions of "The Pleasures of Hope" such variations as the manuscript presents may be communicated to the public.

The poem was instantly successful, and it deserved its instant and great success. Its finished versification, in all probability, aided its immediate impression on the public mind more than it would, had it been published a few years after, when Scott had familiarized the lovers of poetry to the looser ballad rhymes in which his verse-romances were written. There was something in "The Pleasures of Hope" to delight every one: the leading topics of the day were seized on—the Slave Trade—the French Revolution—the Partition of Poland—a number of unconnected pictures were united by a bond which the imagination recognised, and which the judgment did not repudiate; for, distinct as the objects of Hope are, Hope itself is sufficiently one to give a kind of unity to the subject—a unity greater than was felt sufficient for poetical purposes in the case of Akenside's and Rogers' poems. Campbell is said, late in life, to have shed tears when reading the poetry of Goldsmith; and in some of his earliest verses he gives him praise of a kind that shows with what delight he had read the Traveller and the Deserted Village. A stronger proof of this is his unconscious imitation of Goldsmith's forms of expression—his easy idiomatic style in the description of the familiar scenes of domestic life—and the very cadence of his verses. No young writer's style can be altogether his own; but through Campbell's style, while it is often an echo of Goldsmith's, and yet oftener of Darwin's, there is a distinguishing tone—in some respects superior to that of either. In Darwin everything peculiar is glaring picture or mere sound: where he is best he is most unlike himself. Campbell, when he

most reminds us of Darwin, is yet sure to relieve us from the intolerable glare by some appeal to the heart and mind. There is in Darwin a strange confusion, as if sounds were addressed to the eye and colours to the ear, and in all this dealing with the human mind, as influenced through the senses alone, he does not succeed in either producing music or picture. In Goldsmith we sometimes find repose, and almost languor, where you look for elevation. Campbell, though he can scarcely be said to have the exquisite graces of Goldsmith, even in his happiest passages, rarely allows the spirit of his reader to flag. Open anywhere "The Pleasures of Hope." One of Turner's beautiful engravings, in Moxon's edition of 1843, directs our eye to a passage near the beginning of the poem. The watchman on the moonlit sea is thinking of his home:—

"His native hills, that rise in happier climes—
The grot, that heard his song of other times—
His cottage-home, his bark of slender sail—
His glassy lake and broomwood-blossomed vale," &c.

These lines surely were the effect of Goldsmith's lines still echoing on the young poet's dreaming ear:—

"The slow canal, the yellow-blossomed vale,
The willow-tufted bank, the gliding sail," &c.

We transcribe a few lines, without saying whether they are from Darwin or from Campbell. Those who have but a general recollection of both poems will, we think, find some difficulty in saying from which poem they are:—

"Roll on, ye stars! exult in youthful prime;
Mark with bright curves the printless steps of Time;
Near and more near your beamy cars approach,
And lessening orbs on lessening orbs encroach.
Flowers of the sky, ye too to age must yield,
Frail as your silken sisters of the field!
Star after star from heaven's high arch shall rush;
Suns sink on suns, and systems systems crush,
Headlong, extinct, in one dark centre fall,
And death and night and chaos mingle all!
Till o'er the wreck, emerging from the storm,
Immortal nature lifts her changeful form—
Mounts from her funeral pyre on wings of flame,
And soars and shines another and the same."

The poem immediately introduced Campbell into whatever of literary society there was at Edinburgh. Burns was but three years dead; and the men who hailed the advent of Burns were still living, and disposed to welcome with honour the young

poet. Each day increased the popularity of his poem—each day increased the circle of his acquaintances. The Edinburgh booksellers gave him so many new commissions, that there was considerable danger of his becoming little better than a provincial literary hack. The Edinburgh *squans* and their wives asked him to so many dinners and soirées, that he describes himself as fagged to death, and as unable to fulfil his engagements with the booksellers. He appears to have at once given up, and for ever, all notions of studying medicine, which, when he came to Edinburgh, was among his purposes, to make his way to London. As his object was to obtain the means of livelihood among the booksellers, and as the profits of “*The Pleasures of Hope*” gave him the opportunity, he determined to ramble for a while through Germany, there to learn something of its language and literature before visiting London. In June 1800, he went to Newhaven, and then to Leith, from which he and his brother passed over to Hamburg. He was introduced to Klopstock, whom he describes as “a mild, civil, old man.” “Our only intercourse was in Latin.” He gave Klopstock a copy of the third edition of “*The Pleasures of Hope*,” and Klopstock made his visit to Germany pleasant by giving him letters of introduction to his friends in other parts of Germany. He proceeded to Ratisbon; a letter to Anderson describes the scenery. We must make room for a sentence.

“The journey to Ratisbon was tedious but not unpleasant. The general constituents of German scenery are corn-fields, many leagues in extent, and dark tracts of forests, equally extensive. Of this the eye soon becomes tired; but in a few favoured spots there is such an union of wildness, variety, richness, and beauty, as cannot be looked upon without lively emotions of pleasure and surprise. We entered the valley of Heitsch, on the frontier of Bavaria, late in the evening, after the sun had set behind the hills of Saxony. A winding road through a long woody plain leads to this retreat. It was some hours before we got across it, frequently losing our way in the innumerable heaths that intersect each other. At last the shades of the forest grew deeper and darker, till a sudden and steep descent seemed to carry us into another world. It was a total eclipse; but, like the valley of the shadow of death, it was the path to paradise. Suddenly the scene expanded into a broad, grassy glen, lighted from above by a full and beautiful moon. It united with all the wildness of a Scotch glen the verdure of an English garden. The steep hills on either side of our green pathway were covered with a luxuriant growth of trees, where millions of fire-flies flew like stars among the branches. Such enchantment could not be surpassed in *Tempé* itself. I would travel to the walls of China to feel again the wonder and delight that elevated my spirits when I first surveyed this enchanting scene. An incident apparently slight certainly heightened the effect produced by

external beauty. While we gazed up to the ruined fortifications that stretched in bold broken piles across the ridge of the mountain, military music sounded at a distance. Five thousand Austrians, on their march to Bohemia, (where the French were expected to penetrate,) passed our carriage in a long broad line, and encamped in a wide plain at one extremity of the valley. As we proceeded on our way, the rear of their army, composed of Red cloaks and Pandours, exhibited strange and picturesque groups, sleeping on the bare ground, 'with their horses tied to trees; whilst the sound of the Austrian trumpets died faintly away among the echoes of the hills.'

In all Campbell's poetry there is nothing better—we had almost said nothing so good; and the incidents of actual war which he beheld are described with equal effect. He was hospitably received by the Benedictine Monks of the Scottish College of St. James. He describes the splendour and sublimity of the Catholic service, which he probably heard for the first time; and the Cathedral music at Ratisbon he speaks of as grand beyond conception.

"On the morning before the French entered Ratisbon, a solemn ceremony was held. The passage in the Latin service was singularly apropos to the fears of the inhabitants for siege and bombardment. The dreadful prophecy, 'O Jerusalem, Jerusalem! thou shalt be made desolate,' was chanted by a loud single voice from one end of the long echoing Cathedral. A pause more expressive than any sound succeeded, and then the whole thunder of the organs, trumpets, and drums broke in. I never conceived that the *terrific* in music could be carried to such a pitch."

In the Benedictine Monastery of St. James's young Scotchmen were educated for the Roman Catholic priesthood. Its revenues have declined, and the brotherhood, Dr. Beattie tells us, has latterly amounted but to six or seven individuals. They were strongly attached to the interests of the Stuarts; they had for the most part left Scotland at six or seven years of age, and every prejudice of religion and politics was carefully nourished. They and Campbell did not long continue friends. The Jacobite and the Jacobin cannot long hunt in couples. The monks had recommended Campbell to lodgings, where he was robbed by his host or his servants; and when he complained, the monks took part with the native against the stranger. Then came letters home from Campbell, describing the monks as "lazy, loathsome, ignorant, and ill-bred." He tells of one of them attacking him with the most blackguard scurrility, and this in their own refectory.

"I never," says Campbell, "found myself so carried away by indignation. I flew at the scoundrel, and would have rewarded his

insolence had not the others interposed; but prevented as I have been from proceeding to extremities, what I have done is punishable by law, and the wretch has malevolence enough to take advantage of my rashness. O, if I had him at the foot of John's Hill, I would pummel his carrotty locks, and thrash him to the gates of purgatory. I saw him to-day. I was on the bridge along with him, and had grasped my yellow stick to answer his first salutation if he had dared to address me, but he slunk past without saying a word."

This scene would have been enough to have separated Campbell from the Scotch monks; but he also speaks of the conversation whenever he went there turning on politics, and with very ignorant men—and both Campbell and the monks were exceedingly ignorant of the actual springs of European politics—it is not surprising that a temper of disputativeness on both sides, which seems inseparable from the blood which both inherited, rendered all society, in any true sense of the word, impossible.

Campbell's pecuniary means now began to fail, and his letters evince increasing gloom; but his was a mind that the slightest gleam of sunshine was sufficient to cheer, and even for his gloom he had then an unfailing resource in the glorious faculty of imagination. An engagement to supply occasional poems to the *Morning Chronicle*, by which he earned some two guineas for each little copy of verses, makes him the happiest of men, and the very incidents that had almost overcome his spirit, and made his friends fear that melancholy might deepen into insanity, became the subject of his poems. The lines on leaving a scene in Bavaria, are evidence of this. Campbell took advantage of an armistice between Austria and France, to make several excursions into the interior, but when hostilities were renewed, he became apprehensive of personal danger, and returned to Hamburgh. He settled for the winter months at Altona. From Altona his communications with the *Morning Chronicle* became frequent. Several of the poems which have been since collected into the authorized editions of his works, appeared for the first time in this form—many of them with his name, and some—for he began to fear that his name appearing too frequently in newspapers might injure his reputation—were printed without his name. Among the latter was "*The Mariners of England*," and we believe "*The Exile of Erin*," "*Lochiel*," and "*Hohenlinden*," at an after period, were first published without the author's name. Of "*The Exile of Erin*," we have Campbell's own account of the origin:—

"While tarrying at Hamburgh, I made acquaintance with some of the refugee Irishmen, who had been concerned in the rebellion of 1798. Among them was Anthony M'Cann, an honest excellent man

—who is still I believe alive—at least I left him in prosperous circumstances in Altona a few years ago.* When I first knew him, he was in a situation much the reverse; but Anthony commanded respect, whether he was rich or poor. It was in consequence of meeting him one evening on the banks of the Elbe, lonely and pensive at the thoughts of his situation, that I wrote ‘The Exile of Erin.’”

The song is to an Irish air, to which more than one set of words had been written in Ireland—resembling Campbell’s in metre, and the general turn of the sentiment. It seems certain that either among the Irish students at Glasgow, or with M’Cann and his associates, Campbell had fallen in with the air, and some one or other of these songs. One of these songs which is said to have been written in 1792, begins with the words—

“Green were the fields, where my forefathers dwelt, oh
 Erin mavourneen, slawn lath go bragh;
 Though our farm it was small, yet comforts we felt, oh
 Erin mavourneen, slawn lath go bragh;
 At length came the day, when our lease did expire,
 And fain would I live where before lived my sire;
 But oh, well a day, I was forced to retire,
 Erin mavourneen, slawn lath go bragh.”

Campbell’s acquaintanceship with M’Cann and his other Irish friends was likely to lead him into trouble. Perhaps some feeling of this made him not solicitous to connect his name with the “Exile of Erin.” At Ratisbon he knew that his politics were more than suspected. In April he returned, *via* London, to his mother’s, who had during his absence become a widow. While in London he made the acquaintance chiefly through Perry, of Lord Holland, Mackintosh, Rogers, and others of that class. His stay was short. He returned by sea. A lady who travelled by the same vessel, startled him by the information that Campbell the poet had been arrested in London for High Treason, was confined to the Tower, and expected to be executed. This was rather serious. “Coming events cast their shadows before.” When he got to his mother’s, he found her alarmed by similar reports. He at once wrote to the Sheriff of Edinburgh, saying, that he would wait on him, to refute the calumny. Next morning he found the Sheriff disposed to deal kindly with him, but believing in his guilt. “Mr. Campbell, I wish you had not come to me, there is a warrant out against you for High Treason; you are accused of conspiring with General Moreau in Austria, and with the Irish in Hamburgh, to get a French army landed

* Written in 1837—M’Cann is since dead.

in Ireland. Take my advice, and do not press yourself on my notice." "Where are the proofs?" "Oh, you attended Jacobin clubs in Hamburgh, and you came over from thence, in the same vessel with Donovan, who commanded a regiment of rebels at Vinegar Hill." Campbell insisted on an investigation of the charges. His trunks had been seized at Leith—they were examined for documentary proofs of his treason; among his papers was found a copy of "*Ye Mariners of England*." This was not an hour to say more than was necessary of the authorship of the "*Exile of Erin*."

The Irish traitors after all were not treated with any great severity. Campbell tells Donovan's story, which, we dare say, was the story of dozens. At first, things looked bad enough. At Leith he was put into a post-chaise with a King's messenger, who humanely observed at every high post they passed on the road—"Look up, you Irish rascal, and see the height of the gallows from which you will be dangling in a few days."

"A twelvemonth after," says Campbell, "I met Donovan in London, and recognised my gaunt Irish friend, looking very dismal. 'Ha, Donovan, I wish you joy in getting out of the Tower, where, I was told, they had imprisoned you, and were likely to treat you like another Sir William Wallace.'—'Och!' said he, 'good luck to the Tower; black was the day that I was turned out of it. Would that any one would get me into it for life.'—'My stars! and were you not in confinement?'—'Ne'er a bit of it. The Government allowed me a pound sterling a-day as a State prisoner. The Tower gaoler kept a glorious table; and he let me walk out where I liked all day long, pretty secure that I should return at meal times; and, then, he had a nice pretty daughter.'—'And don't you go and see her in the Tower?'—'Why, no, my dear fellow; the course of true love never yet ran smooth. I discovered that she had no money, and she found out that my Irish estates, and all I had told her of their being confiscated in the rebellion, was sheer blarney. So then your merciless Government ordered me to be liberated as a State prisoner. I was turned adrift on the wide world, and glad to become a Reporter to one of the newspapers.'"

While Donovan was living comfortably in the Tower, Campbell was experiencing the Irish adage, that virtue is its own reward. The poverty of his family had increased. An annuity, which constituted part of their support, had died with his father, and distress stared them in the face. A subscription edition of "*The Pleasures of Hope*" was the only resource that suggested itself. It is a sad thing to think how much of advantage to society has been lost by no arrangement having been made in Scotland, where all education is conducted by professorial teaching—in Scotland, so justly proud of her literary men—for Campbell's support, by connecting him with one of her Univer-

sities. In his project of a new edition of "The Pleasures of Hope" Scott and Jeffrey gave him such aid and encouragement as they could; and he went to Liverpool to see what could be done there. From Liverpool he went to London, and seems to have been connected with Lord Minto in some capacity of secretary. In the course of this year (1802) "Lochiel" was written. With the booksellers he contracted for a continuation of Smollett's "History of England," in three volumes, at £100 per volume, which appeared under the title of "Annals of George III." It is an exceedingly useful abridgment, plainly and unambitiously written; and we have found it a work of very convenient reference.

In a poem written in Germany, there are some allusions which Dr. Beattie does not think himself authorized distinctly to explain, to some love-dream which had been floating before the poet's fancy—

"Yea, ever the name I have worshipped in vain,
Shall awake not the sigh of remembrance again."

And, at the same time, we find some verses, which we suppose his cousin Matilda was likely to think very beautiful:

"Oh cherub, Content, at thy moss-covered shrine
I could pay all my vows, if Matilda were mine.
If Matilda were mine, whom enraptured I see,
I would breathe not a vow but to friendship and thee."

This is not very passionate—still it was good enough for the newspaper in which it appeared, and the young lady was not likely to be a severer critic than Mr. Perry or his editor. Campbell, however, does not describe himself as falling in love with Matilda Sinclair for a couple of years after writing these verses; and as more than one political Irishman claims the honour of being the exile of Erin, perhaps some other Matilda was the heroine of these rhymes. The final Matilda, we are told by the poet, was a beautiful, lively, and lady-like woman. She had travelled too; and Campbell's stories of the Rhine and Danube were more than matched by hers of the Rhone and the Loire. In Geneva, too, she had learned the art of making the best cup of Mocha in the world; and there was a tradition that the Turkish Ambassador seeing her at the Opera in a turban and feathers asked who she was; was told she was a Scotch lady; and thereupon said, he had seen nothing so beautiful in Europe. "Her features," says Dr. Beattie, "had much of the Spanish cast; her complexion was dark; her figure graceful, below the middle size; she had great vivacity of manners, energy of mind, and sensibility, or rather irritability, which often impaired her health." The subscription for Campbell's poems was going on well; the

booksellers owed him money for the "Annals," or rather he would be entitled to some when the commission was executed,—he had contracted, to be sure, a debt of £200, for which he paid £40 a-year interest—and he had in his desk a fifty pound note. The lady's father in vain endeavoured to persuade the young people of the madness of marriage in their circumstances. The poet would not listen; the lady did listen; but she got ill from anxiety—and so married they must be and they were.

Early in the next year, it was suggested to Campbell to apply for the Regent's chair in the University of Wilna. The best chance of the poet's success in obtaining the appointment depended on its not being known to those who might be his competitors that he was a candidate. He could not be expected to use the artifices of low intrigue, which, it was to be feared, could alone be successful if the office were thrown open to competition, and the very mention of his name in connexion with the appointment would at once have the effect of terminating the kind of engagements with publishers and journalists by which his daily bread was obtained. Passages from "The Pleasures of Hope" were likely to be cited by his opponents on the subject of the partition of Poland, which would at once dispose of his claims. The secret did, in spite of his care to guard it, transpire; and, after some communication with persons connected with the Russian legation, he felt it prudent to retire from the contest.

Campbell's letters at this time, though often written in ill health, and under depressing anxieties, shew that his married life was happy. A letter from a young female relation, who was at this time on a visit with them, says, "they were greatly attached. Mrs. C. studied her husband in every way. As one proof, the poet being closely devoted to his books and writing during the day, she would never suffer him to be disturbed by questions or intrusion, but left the door of his room a little ajar, that she might every now and then have a silent peep at him. On one occasion, she called me to come softly on tiptoe, and she would shew me the poet in a moment of inspiration. We stole softly behind his chair—his eye was raised—the pen in his hand, but he was quite unconscious of our presence, and we retired unsuspected."

He thought for awhile of Edinburgh for a residence, but London or its neighbourhood was the only place where the kind of employment he wanted was to be obtained. He had formed a connexion with the *Star* newspaper—we believe, translating for them matter from the foreign journals—which gave him four guineas a-week. He also wrote for Reviews; and he seems to have been anxiously looking round him to purchase a share in

some Magazine, thinking something might be made by adding the publisher's profits to those of the literary man. His health, and that of his young family, rendered it desirable to live in the country; and he found a house at a moderate rent at Sydenham Common, from which he rode into town every day. He could scarcely have placed himself in any situation more favourable for health, or for study; and society was, in every sense of the word, good. He could reckon on two hundred a-year from the "Star" and the "Philosophical Magazine," both of which were conducted by the same proprietor. This did little to supply his wants, when out of it it is considered he had to keep a horse. He took whatever employment he could get. He wrote a vast deal, "dispirited," he says, "beneath all hope of raising my reputation by what I *could* write, I contracted for only anonymous labour, and, of course, at an humble price." Overwork produced restlessness at night, and the necessity of having recourse to opiates. His Edinburgh friends continued to obtain subscriptions for his poems. Richardson—a friend of his who yet survives, was indefatigable—and Scott was active. There are some letters from Campbell to Scott, in which two or three projects of publishing lives of the British poets, and large editions of their works, in partnership, are suggested; they failed. In one of the letters to Scott, we have the "Battle of Copenhagen," the first form of the "Battle of the Baltic." Some exceedingly spirited stanzas are omitted in the recast, still the second poem is far superior to the first. Dr. Beattie has also given us the opportunity of comparing "Lochiel's Warning" as it now stands with the original draft. The "Battle of Copenhagen" is cut down to a third of its original dimensions. "Lochiel" is amplified by additional incidents, and the pictures are throughout heightened. Both poems are greatly improved; and to young poets, we think, the comparison of these works in their first and in their finished state would be a most useful study.

A letter to Scott, dated October 2, 1805, concludes with the postscript, "*His Majesty has been pleased to confer a pension of £200 a-year on me.* GOD SAVE THE KING."

Campbell himself, and other writers who have addressed the public through the various channels of periodical literature, have been the main instruments in creating a Public, and thus giving the chance of respectable bread to those who may select this unobtrusive way of communicating instruction. It is probable that the author will at all times be less highly paid than the clergyman or the physician, but that he has the means of living at all, with the ordinary decencies of life, is due to Johnson, above all other men, and, after him, to those who have rendered it impossible that men shall consent to do without intellectual

food. There is not a nook of Scotland¹ which is not better for having produced Burns. His poems and Campbell's would not, in all probability, have been published at all, if it were not for local subscriptions. The love of letters, now diffused everywhere, renders such patronage no longer necessary; and there now is, probably, a stronger feeling against an expedient of the kind than suggested itself to any one in the year 1805. However this be, at the time when Campbell obtained the pension, which, as far as is known, was given by Fox at Lord Holland's solicitation, it did not appear unbecoming to his friends to seek to make some permanent provision for his family, by again publishing a subscription edition of his poems. Horner worked hard for him, and with good success. In a letter to Richardson, Horner says, "It may do you good, among the slaves in Scotland, to let it be known that Mr. Pitt * put his name to the subscription when he was at Bath, and we hope that most of the Ministers will follow him."

With this letter, says Beattie, "closed the year 1805—an eventful year to Campbell. It left him in improved health, with new friends, a settled income, and cheering prospects."

There appears a strong reason to believe that Fox did not intend his favours to Campbell to end with the pension. It was small, and it was reduced by taxation and fees of office, to £168 a year. Lord Grenville interested himself for him, and his friends thought their success certain, when Fox's death defeated their hopes. It is probable that Fox himself would have felt delight in serving Campbell. Campbell tells of a dinner in company with Fox at Lord Holland's—the poet was charmed with him. "What a proud day," he says, "to shake hands with the Demosthenes of his time—to converse familiarly with the great man, whose sagacity I revered as unequalled; whose benevolence was no less apparent in his simple manners—and to walk arm-in-arm round the room with him." They spoke of Virgil. Fox was pleased, and said at parting, "Mr. Campbell, you must come and see me at St. Anne's Hill; there we shall talk more of these matters." Fox, turning to Lord Holland, said, "I like Campbell; he is so right about Virgil."

Campbell, we said, rode each day into London. This became fatiguing; there were frequent invitations to dinner parties which could not well be refused. His health was unequal to the slightest excess, and "the foundation was laid for habits, that in after years he found it hard, or even impossible to conquer."

It would appear that the variety of his engagements, and still more the perplexity of his circumstances, prevented his writing

* Pitt died three weeks after the date of this letter.

any poetry for some two or three years. He looked round him for some German poem to translate, and asked Scott to direct his attention to something in that way. It is fortunate that he found none, as we should probably not have had his *Gertrude of Wyoming*, which was now commenced.

Among Campbell's most intimate friends at Sydenham was a family of the name of Mayo, and in a letter to one of the ladies of the family he tells her, that in his description of the father of *Gertrude*, Wynell Mayo, the father of his correspondent, was represented.

He quotes a few lines of the poem from his manuscript, which are not materially altered in the printed copy :—

“How reverend was the look, serenely aged,
Undimmed by weakness, shade, or turbid ire,
When all but kindly fervours were assuaged :
Such was the most beloved, the gentlest sire :
And though amid that calm of thought entire
Some high and haughty features might betray
A soul impetuous once, 'twas earthly fire,
That fled composure's intellectual ray,
As *Aetna's* fires grow dim before the rising day.”

We regret that Dr. Beattie seems unable to tell us anything about the origin of *Gertrude*, the most elaborate and the most beautiful of Campbell's works. This is the more provoking, as, from the complexity of the stanza alone, it is impossible that it should not have undergone, in almost every line, repeated changes. A passage from *La Fontaine's* romance of *Barneck and Saldorf*, is printed by Dr. Beattie, from some fancied resemblance to the story of *Gertrude*. We have not read *La Fontaine's* romance, but there is nothing in the passage quoted which would suggest the slightest obligation from either writer to the other, and there is not any evidence that Campbell ever saw *La Fontaine's* work, which, from the date given by Beattie, would appear to have been printed in Berlin only a year or two before. Between Campbell's poem of *Gertrude* and *Chateaubriand's Atala*, there are some points of resemblance—not in the story, but in the general picture of American scenery and of Indian manners. The contrasts of savage and social life are also brought out in very much the same kind of feeling. The “*Areouski*” and the “*Manitous*” are, perhaps necessarily, common property; and the mention of the God to whom the Christians pray, in the same language, does not show more than that each imitates, with such skill as he can, the reputed dialect of the native tribes. The same may, perhaps, be said of “the fever-halm and sweet *sagamite*,” and the sound of *Outalissi*, as a name for an Indian warrior, may have equally affected both

poets; but these are resemblances of a different kind, and we think that the study of Chateaubriand, more than anything else, has misled Campbell into the few instances of false painting that surprise us in *Gertrude*. Chateaubriand's scene is in Florida. This Campbell forgets; and we suspect that some of the plants and birds of Florida are by this accident brought into Pennsylvania.

The deep untrodden grot,

"Where oft the reading hours sweet Gertrude wore,"

was closed by mountains to the east, and open to the west. It was a spot where the native tribes in days of old might perhaps "explore their father's dust, or lift their voice to the Great Spirit"—

Rocks sublime,
To human art a sportive semblance bore,
And yellow lichens colour'd all the clime,
Like moonlight battlements and towers decayed by time.

But high in amphitheatre above,
Gay-tinted woods their massy foliage threw;
Breathed but an air of heaven, and all the grove
As if instinct with living spirit grew,
Rolling its verdant gulfs of every hue. *
And now suspended was the pleasing din—
Now from a murmur faint it swelled anew,
Like the first note of organ—heard within
Cathedral aisles—ere yet the symphony began.

Chateaubriand's description of the Indian cemeteries, in a passage which we are compelled to quote at length, we cannot but think suggested the passage we have quoted from Campbell.

"De-là nous arrivâmes à une gorge de vallée ou je vis un ouvrage merveilleux : c'était un pont naturel, semblable à celui de la Virginie, dont tu a peut-être entendu parler. Les hommes, mon fils, surtout ceux de ton pays, imitent souvent la nature, et leurs copies sont toujours petites; il n'en est pas ainsi de la nature quand elle a l'air de vouloir imiter les travaux des hommes, mais en leur offrant en effet des modèles. C'est alors qu'elle jet des ponts du sommet d'une montagne au sommet d'une autre montagne, suspend les chemins dans les nues, refond des fleuves pour canaux, sculpte des monts pour colonnes, et pour bassins creuse des mers.

"Nous passâmes sous l'arche unique de ce pont, et nous nous trouvâmes devant une autre merveille. C'était le cimetière des Indiens de la Mission, ou les *bocages de la Mort*. Le père Aubry avait permis à ses néophytes d'ensevelir leurs morts à leur manière et de conserver à leur sépulture son nom sauvage. Le sol en était divisé, comme le champ commun des moissons, en autant de lots

qu'il y avait de familles. Chaque lot faisait à lui seul un bois, qui variait selon le goût de ceux qui l'avaient planté. Un ruisseau serpentait sans bruit au milieu de ces bocagos; on l'appelait *le ruisseau de la paix*; ce riant asile des âmes était fermé à l'orient par le pont sous lequel nous avons passé: deux collines le bornaient au septentrion et au midi: il ne s'ouvrait qu'à l'occident ou s'élevait un grand bois des sapins. Les troncs de ces arbres, rouges, marbrés de vert, montant sans branche jusqu'à leur cime, ressemblaient à de hautes colonnes, et formaient le peristyle de ce temple de la Mort. Dans ce bois régnoit un bruit religieux semblable au sourd mugissement d'une église Chrétienne: mais lorsqu'on pénétrait au fond du sanctuaire on n'entendait plus que les hymnes des oiseaux, qui célébraient à la mémoire des morts une fête éternelle."

The remarkable expression of the forests rolling their "verdant gulfs," we have in another passage:—

"J'entraînai la fille de Simagham aux pieds des côteaux, que formaient des golfes de verdure, en avançant leur promontoires dans la savane."

In Campbell's description of Pennsylvanian scenery minute inaccuracies have been shewn, but in the descriptions of a terrestrial paradise this is a permitted license, and the general effect is true. An American who met him at Dr. Beattie's in 1840, told him it was as true to nature as if written on the spot. "I read," said Campbell, "every description I could find of this valley and could lay hands on, and saw several travellers who had been there. I should wish to see it, but am too old to undertake the voyage, and yet I don't like the idea that I am too old to do anything I wish. My heart is as young as ever." His American friend told him of a pilgrimage that he and others were led to make to the spot, from their admiration of Campbell's genius. "It was autumn, and the quiet shores of the lake were bathed in the yellow light of Indian summer. Every day we wandered through the primeval forests, and, when tired, we used to sit down under their solemn shade, among the falling leaves, and read '*Gertrude of Wyoming*.' It was in these thick woods, where we could hear no sound but the song of the wild birds, or the squirrel cracking his nuts, away from the busy world, that I felt the power of Campbell's genius." Campbell took his hand, pressed it, and said—"God bless you, sir, you make me happy, although you make me weep. This is more than I can bear. It is dearer to me than all the praise I have had before—to think that in that wild American scenery I have had such readers. I will go to America yet." When they parted, Campbell gave him a copy of the illustrated edition of his poems. "Take it with you," were his words, "and if, with your '*Gertrude*,' you ever go again to the valley of Wyoming,

it may be a pleasure to her to hear you say, 'Campbell gave me this.'

Some fourteen or fifteen years after the publication of *Gertrude*, Campbell found himself engaged in a correspondence with the son of Brandt, the Indian chief, who was represented by the poet as the leader of a savage party, whose ferocity gave to war more than its own horrors. Campbell had abused him, almost in the language of an American newspaper.

"The mammoth comes—the foe—the monster Brandt—
With all his howling desolating band."

It was rather a serious moment when a gentleman, with an English name, called on Campbell, demanding, on the part of the son of Brandt, some explanation of this language, as applied to his father. A long letter from Campbell is printed in Stone's "*Life of Brandt*," addressed to the Mohawk chief, *Ahyonwalghis*, commonly called John Brandt, Esq., of the Grand River, Upper Canada, in which he states the various authorities which had misled him into the belief of the truth of the incidents on which his notion of Brandt's character was founded, and which it seems misrepresented it altogether. It was no doubt a strange scene, and the poet could with truth say, and with some pride, too, that when he wrote this poem, it was unlikely that he should ever have contemplated the case of the son or daughter of an Indian chief being affected by its contents. He promises in future editions to correct the involuntary error; and he does so, by saying in a note, that the "Brandt" of the poem is a pure and declared character of fiction. This does not satisfy Mr. Stone's sense of justice, who would have the tomahawk applied to the offending rhyme, and who thinks anything less than this is a repetition of the offence. Beattie ought to have published the correspondence.

The next poem of Campbell's was *O'Connor's child*. "The theme," says Dr. Beattie, "was suggested by seeing a flower in his own garden, called, 'Love lies bleeding.'" Beattie in communicating this information, uses inverted commas, but does not say whether he gives us the poet's words or not, and we should wish to know the fact, as it would in some degree affect our estimate of the poem. Nothing can be more perfect than this poem is throughout. In one or two passages of "*The Pleasures of Hope*," and in a few wild words at the close of the "*Battle of the Baltic*," the students of Campbell's poetry might be prepared for lines expressive of what Schiller, or one of his translators, calls "the fancifulness of despair."

* See a translation of the "*Kindesgrüß*" in Merivale's Schiller.

" Let us think of them that sleep,
Full many a fathom deep,
By thy wild and stormy steep,
Elsmore.

" Soft sigh the winds of Heaven o'er their grave!
While the billow mournful rolls,
And the mermaid's song condole,
Singing glory to the souls
Of the brave!"

" The wildness of the fancies through the whole poem—the leading thought of her lover's death everywhere re-appearing, and linked with the flower that first grew upon his grave, is, we think, almost more beautifully conceived, and more beautifully expressed, than anything we know in English poetry. The old fancies of the hyacinth and Shakespeare's little western flower—"before, milk-white, now purple with love's wound"—fade into nothingness before it.* Campbell himself has been known to say that he preferred "O'Connor's Child" to any other of his poems. It was, he said, rapidly written—the work of a fortnight. In the illustrated edition of the poems, there are two misprints, which, as they alter the meaning, we had better point out. One is—

" And I behold, Oh God! Oh God!
His life-blood oozing from the sod."

The other is—

" Dragg'd to that hated mansion back,
How long in thralldom's grasp I lay
I knew not, for my soul was black,
And knew no change of night or day."

In the first, the word printed "behold" should be *beheld*,—in the other, the word "knew" should be *know*. In both, a mean-

*. A fancy of the same kind now and then appears in the old ballads or poems published as such. In a Jacobite song of 1745, printed in Cronick's *Remains*, we have the lines :—

" My father's blood 's in that flower tap,
My brother's in that harchell's blossom;
This white rose was steeped in my love's blood,
And I'll aye wear it in my bosom "

For Shakespeare's "little western flower," the reader who has the opportunity of referring to Halpin's "Essay on the Vision of Oberon," published by the Shakespeare Society, or Craik's "Romance of the Peerage," will probably receive great pleasure and instruction from their examination of the allegory. We do not say that we quite agree with them, or either of them. Craik's "Romance of the Peerage" is a most important and valuable addition to our historical literature. Much of it is drawn from sources hitherto neglected, or very imperfectly explored.

ing inconsistent with the general feeling of the passage is unfortunately suggested.

We cannot follow Dr. Beattie in narrating how the means of life were made out by Campbell. He lectured—he published specimens of the poets, accompanied with criticism, always sensible, often acute; but his prose has no abiding life. It did its day's work. Letters from Paris, which he visited in 1814, are printed. They contain little more than his impressions about works of art, with the principles of which he was not sufficiently acquainted to justify us in transcribing what he says—and his opinion of Mrs. Siddons, which he afterwards worked into a sort of trade life of her. In 1821, he undertook the editorship of the *New Monthly Magazine*, which he continued for nine or ten years. At the end of this time, he found himself in the publisher's debt, and felt obliged to look round him for employment of the same kind. He became editor of the "*Metropolitan Magazine*," and soon after, Rogers lent him five hundred pounds to purchase a share in the *Metropolitan*. The money had a narrow escape, as the bankruptcy of some copartner occurred at the time. Rogers had refused taking any security, but Campbell insured his life, and had some deed executed that gave Rogers rights against whatever property he had. Campbell, though always a struggling man, seems to have been anxious that his improvidence should not injure his friends. To his own family—his mother and sisters, his generosity was very great.

The book contains some very painful scenes, on which we do not think it desirable to enter. Of two children of his marriage, one died in infancy; the other was, during his father's life, in such doubtful health as to render it necessary that he should live at a distance from home under medical care. Campbell felt it necessary to live in London, and he felt it necessary to allow himself to be made chairman of Polish clubs, and to preside at patriotic dinners. This brought him acquainted with strange companions, whom it was not at all times possible to get rid of. Dr. Beattie tells us of some affecting scenes, when the broken-hearted man was thoughtlessly reproached at his own table by a guest who thought the host had taken too much wine, and who ought himself either not to have taken any, or not stopped at what is not inappropriately called the cross drop.

In the cause of education Campbell was at all times an enthusiast. To him, above all others, is to be ascribed the origination and the success of the London University. His election to the Rectorship of Glasgow University was the most gratifying incident of his life, and it resulted in permanent advantages to that institution.

Campbell resided for a while at St. Leonard's, and afterwards

settled in London. These were moments of great pecuniary difficulty and embarrassment; but towards the close of life, and at the moment when such relief was most seasonable, additions came to his income by some two or three legacies. In one instance, the sum that seemed providentially sent came in vain, for without waiting to consult any one, he laid it out in an annuity for his own life, which lasted for little more than a year after this transaction.

His wife had been some years dead. There is some obscure intimation of his making some overtures towards a second marriage, which failed. He was fond, passionately fond of children, and it occurred to him that one of his nieces—a girl of some thirteen or fourteen years of age—might come from Scotland to be his housekeeper. He was to teach her French. His only son was sufficiently provided for; and the poet promised her parents to leave her whatever little property he might have at his death.

In one respect alone are we dissatisfied with Dr. Beattie's book. In every line of it there breathes the strongest affection towards the poet, and yet how, where, or when their intimacy commenced, the book gives us no information whatever. For many of the latter years of Campbell's life, Dr. Beattie was his most anxious friend, and we believe it is in the strictest sense of the word true, that but for him that life must have closed long before it did. Campbell removed to Boulogne in September 1843. Every object of his removal was disappointed. He found the place scarcely cheaper than that which he left; he found the climate worse; he had all the trouble and expense of a removal. He fixed plans of study, and tried to execute them. The custom-house regulations interfered with his receiving English books. He would, when weary of reading, diversify the day by conversation; but where were his old friends? "Home-sickness," says his kind physician, "was on him."

He sought to write to his friends, but his letters became few and short; still they were cheerful. At last, a letter from his niece brought over Dr. Beattie. When he arrived, he found a Sister of Charity assisting her in attending on the dying poet. When Beattie was introduced into his chamber, he complained of chilliness—morbid chilliness. He held out his hand, and thanked Beattie, and the other friends who had come to assist him.

This was June the 4th. On the 6th he was able to converse more freely; but his strength had become more reduced, and on being assisted to change his posture, he fell back in the bed insensible. Conversation was carried on in the room in whispers; and Campbell uttered a few sentences so unconnected, that his friends were doubtful whether he was conscious or not of what

was going on in his presence, and had recourse to an artifice to learn. One of them spoke of the poem of *Hohenlinden*, and pretending to forget the author's name, said he had heard it was by a Mr. Robinson. Campbell saw the trick, was amused, and said playfully, but in a calm and distinct tone, "No; it was one *Toua Campbell*." The poet had—as far as a poet can—become for years indifferent to posthumous fame. In 1838, five years before this time, he had been speaking to some friends in Edinburgh on the subject. "When I think of the existence which shall commence when the stone is laid above my head, how can literary fame appear to me—to any one—but as nothing. I believe, when I am gone, justice will be done to me in this way—that I was a pure writer. It is an inexpressible comfort, at my time of life, to be able to look back and feel that I have not written one line against religion or virtue." The next day swelling of the feet appeared. In answer to an inquiry, he replied, with a remarkable expression of energy, "Yes, I have entire control over my mind. I am quite"—Beattie lost the last word, but thinks it was "resigned." "Then, with shut eyes and a placid expression of countenance, he remained silent but thoughtful. When I took leave at night, his eye followed me anxiously to the door, as if to say, 'Shall we meet to-morrow?'" Dr. Beattie's journal records a few days passed like the last. Religious feeling was, as the closing scene approached, more distinctly expressed. Beattie was thinking of the lines in *THE LAST MAN*, when he heard with delight the dying man express his belief "in life and immortality brought to light by the Saviour."

This spirit shall return to Him
Who gave the heavenly spark;
Yet think not, sun, it shall be dim
When thou thyself art dark!
• No! it shall live again, and shine
In bliss unknown to beams of thine,
By Him recall'd to breath
Who captive led captivity—
Who robb'd the grave of victory,
And took the sting from death.

"To his niece he said, 'Come, let us sing praises to 'Christ;' then, pointing to the bedside, he added, 'Sit here.' 'Shall I pray for you?' she said. 'Oh yes,' he replied; 'let us pray for each other.'"

The liturgy of the Church of England was read; he expressed himself "soothed—comforted." "The next day, at a moment when he appeared to be sleeping heavily, his lips suddenly moved; and he said, '*We shall see * * to-morrow*,'—naming a

long departed friend." On the next day he expired without a struggle.

This was the fifteenth of June; on Thursday, the 27th, he was interred in Westminster Abbey, in a new grave, in the centre of Poet's corner. Among the mourners in the funeral procession were the Duke of Argyle, and other representatives of the house of Campbell; Sir Robert Peel and Lord Strangford. Lord Brougham was there, and Lockhart and Macaulay. A monument is projected to his memory, and on the committee are Lord John Russell and Sir Robert Peel.

Among Dr. Beattie's recollections of the poet's conversations a year or two before, he tells of the emphasis with which he repeated Tickell's lines on the burial of Addison. "Lest I should forget them," Dr. Beattie adds, "he sent me a copy of them next day in his own handwriting." With these lines from one of the most affecting poems in the language we close our notice of a book in many respects honourable to its author; in none more than in his anxious wish to conceal the faults and to vindicate the memory of his distinguished friend.

Can I forget the dismal night that gave
 My soul's best part for ever to the grave?
 How silent did his old companions tread,
 By midnight lamps, the mansions of the dead!
 Through breathing statues, then unheeded things;
 Through rows of warriors, and through walks of kings!
 What awe did the slow, solemn, knell inspire—
 The pealing organ, and the pausing choir!
 The duties by the lawn-robed prelate paid,
 And the last words that "dust to dust" convey'd.
 While speechless o'er thy closing grave we bend,
 Accept those tears, thou dear departed friend.
 Oh, gone for ever! take this last adieu,
 And sleep in peace.

ART. VIII.—*Report from the Select Committee on Public Business, together with the Minutes of Evidence, and Appendix.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 14th August 1848.

THE ensuing Session of Parliament can scarcely pass over in the same manner as the last. The upheaving of the Continent, with the overthrow of its Governments, on the one hand, and the outbreak in Ireland, on the other, combined with the disorganized state of our political parties to enable ministers, last year, to tide through an unusually prolonged Session without any effective opposition, notwithstanding the signal and disgraceful failure of their budget, the abandonment of almost all their promised measures of improvement, and the derelinquishment, in a great measure, so far as legislation was concerned, of the functions of a Government. They cannot expect a like forbearance during the Session that is about to commence. The country will not again submit, nor allow their representatives to submit, to the mockery of Parliament sitting for nine months, and leaving no results beyond three, or at most four, Acts which will be of any permanent benefit to the country, and these not of great value in themselves, except the Health of Towns Bill, and far within—in respect to the advantages conferred by them—what they ought to have been. Even if the state of the Continent and of Ireland should continue as unsettled and disturbed as during the eventful year which has lately closed, men would not acquiesce in that policy of stationary inaction which during its currency our Legislature pursued. The first effect, indeed, of such convulsions, as we have witnessed among the nations abroad, is to produce a pause,—to create a cautious dread of making *any* movement, lest the mere motion should precipitate an unlooked for and disastrous crisis. Now, however, that our stability for the time has been ascertained, and our position thoroughly reconnoitred and understood, reflection and experience draw from such convulsions, as the true lesson which they teach, this conclusion, that not another moment should be lost in remedying existing abuses, relieving the people from unjust burdens, convincing them that the Constitution under which they live is truly fitted beneficently to improve their condition and to fulfil the objects of social government, and enlisting in its support, by a participation in its franchises, those classes who may be relied on as intelligent friends of order, instead of leaving them to swell the ranks of its enemies, driven there by a sense of the injustice done them in their exclusion. We can scarcely believe that there exists a single anti-reformer or protectionist,

who, looking back to last February, would calmly and deliberately desire that the Reform Bill and the repeal of the Corn Laws had been then still to be agitated for, and who does not now feel in his heart that the safety of this country, amid the crash of continental kingdoms, was, owing, under God, to these two measures having been previously accomplished. All thinking men must be more thoroughly confirmed, by the events of last year, in their conviction of the fearful danger of resisting reforms rendered necessary by the advance of society, till the pressure becomes so great as to burst through every barrier, and, consequently, in all likelihood, to sweep away in an overwhelming flood, not merely the obstacles to improvement, but the whole existing political institutions of the country, leaving it open to the disorders and desolations of anarchy, or, to what is scarcely less to be deplored, the iron domination of military despotism. A loud call will therefore be made on the Government for *action*—for an advance onward; and if they do not respond to it in a way fitted to meet, to a considerable extent, the desires of the country, they must be prepared to abide an assault which, though it may not peril their existence as a Ministry, will at least require all their own energies, and the strenuous aid of former political opponents, in order to repel it.

Arrangements have already been made for such an assault, in the more complete organization, as a separate political party, of those liberal members of the House of Commons who recognise Mr. Hume and Mr. Cobden as their leaders, and whose strength and influence will mainly depend on the zeal with which they are supported, beyond the walls of Parliament, in regard to the special question which they have selected for their first battlefield, that of Financial Reform. The position about to be taken up by these members will render necessary some re-formation and new combinations among the other parties in the House. The Ministry, bereft of the support of so large a portion of their followers, now to be arrayed resolutely against them, must, of necessity, rely on the aid of former opponents of the Conservative party, unless they are prepared to go much further than any one at present expects; and, so far as regards the high Tory portion of that party, we believe they may rely with confidence on such aid being given them—not only on the question of Financial Reform, but also generally, to maintain them in the administration of the affairs of the country. For a short time after the death of Lord George Bentinck, it was supposed that that event might open up a way for a re-union of the two divisions of the Conservative body, so as to hold out the prospect of the restoration of an united Conservative Government with Peel at its head; without which re-union, a Conservative ministry could

not be constituted with any hope of permanency. Subsequent declarations, however, of continued personal hostility to Sir Robert, on the part of the protectionists, seem to preclude all likelihood of their again taking him for their leader; and, indeed, the circumstances attending their previous connexion and separation present, we should think, an insurmountable barrier to their acting together. So far back as May 1844, when Sir Robert was still upholding the Corn Laws, we ventured to record our opinion, that even then, the aristocracy whom he served looked on him with lively suspicion. "On the other hand," we observed, "they, mortified to find themselves, with all their power and influence, so dependent on his talents and management, jealous of his profession of liberal views which they can scarcely reconcile with devotion to their service, cannot but harbour the strongest suspicion, that if he could base his own power on another equally sure foundation, he would betray their cause." They now believe that he *did* betray their cause; and though this might be forgiven in consideration of the effect of the repeal of the Corn Laws, in the protection which that measure must now be acknowledged to have provided against revolution and anarchy, they are doubtless convinced that his change of conduct as to that matter did not result from a change of opinion, but was the mere carrying out of long held, but long concealed, views which would lead him again, if he had the power, to the adoption, when fitting opportunities occurred, of other measures, equally obnoxious to them, and equally injurious, as they fancy, to their interests as a class. Even, therefore, in their present hopeless destitution of leaders of their own body, they will not in all likelihood turn again to Sir Robert Peel. If so, however, they can scarcely venture to assume power themselves, and consequently, they will not seek to turn out the Whigs, and so place the reins of government in hands in which they would be far more unwilling to see them. To them, therefore, Lord John Russell may confidently look for support against the attacks of the more advanced section of the Liberal party, not only in resisting their demands for retrenchment and further reform, but generally, we should anticipate, in maintaining him in power, inasmuch as they may justly consider the interests which they chiefly regard, safer under his government than under one in which the influence of Sir Robert Peel would be predominant.

The old division, into Whig and Tory, is fast breaking down, and a new fusion and casting of parties is in rapid progress. Of this the recent contest in the West Riding of Yorkshire presented at once a proof and a specimen. The immense constituency of that important district may be taken as affording a

fair representation of the general constituency of the empire, including, as it does, within it all classes and all interests, in a proportion not differing greatly from that in which they exist in the nation at large. At the late election this constituency was nearly equally divided; but the two divisions were totally distinct from those which, from time immemorial, had prevailed in Yorkshire. The Fitzwilliams and the Lascelleses no longer headed the opposing hosts of Whigs and Tories, each phalanx combining a due mixture of the aristocracy, the farmers, and the traders of the county. They now fought in the same ranks. The Tory and the Whig aristocracy, with their respective dependents and adherents, were arrayed, as one united body, in opposition to that of the great mass of the free-trading reformers who, with the force derived from the enthusiasm consequent on the victory of the Corn-Law League, so triumphantly seated Mr. Cobden, at the last general election, without a contest. The division exhibited on this occasion will, we doubt not, ere long, be that which will separate the whole constituencies of the kingdom into two opposing parties. The members of the present House of Commons who hold the views represented by the defeated candidate in the Yorkshire election are, as yet, it is true, a comparatively small portion of its total number; but they constitute a nucleus round which will be formed a most powerful and influential body, constituting one of the two divisions between which the contest for power, and for the administration of the affairs of the empire, will thenceforward be waged. Preparatory to this contest, the *old* Whig party will disappear. As Mr. Fitzwilliam had to retreat from the arena in Yorkshire, so the party of which he was a representative will have to withdraw from the national arena whereon it has so long performed such a conspicuous part, and it will be chiefly merged in the general aristocratic body, formed by such a union throughout the nation as was effected for the time between the Whig and Tory aristocracy of Yorkshire at the recent election.

Meanwhile, and until the new parties in the progress of arrangement shall be more fully developed, and more distinctly formed, the Protectionists, who must now be hopeless of resisting the further progress of free-trade principles, but who, in regard to many subjects of the deepest concern to the aristocracy, as a body, have ground to rely far more certainly on Lord John Russell than on Sir Robert Peel, will incline to support the former. His natural sympathies, like his connexions, are all towards the aristocracy; and the old Whig party, whose sentiments he very truly reflects, was eminently aristocratic. In particular, his support of the Established Church, being founded on real attachment and decided principle, will be persevering

and resolute; and the maintenance of the Establishment will ultimately form one of the grand questions on which the two future political parties of the country will be mainly opposed. The great strength of the Church of England, founded not merely on its intimate connexion with the aristocracy, and the existence of such a powerful interest on their part to maintain it, but on the opinion and reverence of a large proportion of the population of all classes, will prevent any question as to its overthrow being directly raised for years to come. But come that question will; and, considering the railway-speed at which events advance now-a-days, it may come sooner than is anticipated. The prospect of its advent, however, must even now affect the composition of the political parties undergoing the process of re-casting. Accordingly, in the West Riding election the supporters of the Establishment were found generally ranged on the side of the aristocracy, while the great body of the Dissenters took their place in the opposing ranks. Now, on this great question, while the aristocracy may fully rely, as we have said, on the hearty and continued support of Lord John Russell, they can scarcely look for that of Sir Robert Peel beyond the period during which he may need the support of the Church more than it needs his. They will not probably forget that he was the champion of the cause of Roman Catholic exclusion till the moment when his defection secured the triumph of that of Emancipation; and that he upheld the Corn Laws till the crisis when a blow from his hand could deal destruction to them; and they will consequently anticipate that, if the period should arrive when the Church has to engage in a life-and-death struggle for existence, though he may have stood by it steadily up to that instant, he might then turn round, and lead its assailants to a certain victory. We incline, therefore, to look for such a co-operation between the Tory party and Lord John Russell as will, for the present, maintain him in power, and may ultimately lead to a permanent connexion between him and them. As for Sir Robert Peel, he will scarcely commit himself to the movement now commenced, till it has made farther progress, and attained a surer prospect of final success. Meanwhile, he will give a general countenance to the principle of effecting every practical reform in the financial and other branches of administration; and, standing aloof from any specific proposition as to extent or details, he will exhibit his own unquestionably superior qualifications for dealing with such reforms—pointing out the practical errors of the authors of the various “amateur budgets” that have been or may be brought forward, and leading the country as much as possible to the inference that no one is better fitted than himself to effect a great and

substantial relief in the burdens of the country, without any sacrifice of its security or influence. And truly the country is well prepared to believe this of him. With a nearly unbounded confidence in his sagacity, and in his tact in seizing the critical moment for accomplishing his objects, they believe that he is, at heart, in favour of the *movement*, while his very caution and system of concealment impress them with a mysterious conviction of his skill and power in commanding success. If he saw his way clear to assume the leadership of the movement party, and to take office with their support, he would probably enlist under him many of the adherents of the present Ministry, who would not willingly make the stand to which their leader inclines; and we believe that the great mass of the non-partisan portion of the people, and almost the whole of the trading and commercial community, would rally round him, raising him to power, and maintaining him there, in despite of all the aristocratic or party interest that could be exerted against him. He is too cautious, however, to take such a step suddenly, and before he himself sees clearly that such anticipations as these would certainly be realized. During this session, therefore, in all probability, while we shall witness a more thoroughly organized opposition to the Ministry, and more numerous as well as more vigorous assaults on their administration, we shall also, in all likelihood, unless the feeling out of doors be so strongly expressed as to encourage a decided movement on the part of Sir Robert Peel, see them still in office at the end of it; more from the non-existence, as yet, of any party able to take their place, than from confidence in them on the part either of the constituency or of their representatives. Still they will have an arduous session to work through, and several most important and urgent questions to dispose of. To one or two of these we propose shortly directing the attention of our readers, but we must first advert to a preliminary subject of no inconsiderable importance, which will probably engage the attention of Parliament, viz., the improvement of the mode of conducting its business, so as, in some measure, to check the interminable delays which interrupt, to such an extent, the progress of legislation, and to admit of a greater approximation being made towards the business of the country being really done.

Not long before last session closed, this subject was referred to a select Committee of the House of Commons, appointed "to consider the best means of promoting the despatch of public business in this House." The Committee included the leading men on all sides of the House; and it had the peculiar advantage of receiving evidence not only from the Speaker, as to the improvements which his experience suggested, but also from

M. Guizot, as to the conduct of business in the French Chambers, and from Mr. Curtis, an American citizen, as to that of the United States' Congress. The recommendations of the Speaker had mainly in view the checking of the interruptions to debates, by motions for adjourning the House, or for adjourning the debate, affording a means of bringing to a close a debate already adjourned, and saving some out of the "eighteen" questions which, in addition to those in Committee, must of necessity be put in order to carry any one bill through the House, and on each of which questions, and every amendment upon them, a separate debate and division may now take place. The evidence of M. Guizot and Mr. Curtis chiefly related to the methods in use, in the French Chambers and in Congress, for closing debates, and as to the rule, in the latter Assembly, for restricting the length of the speeches of individual members, called the "one hour rule," from the period to which each member is limited.

The privilege possessed in our House of Commons of over and over again, in the course of the same discussion, moving an adjournment of the House, or of the debate, affords a means of most unduly and unfairly obstructing the business, and of evading the rule which prevents any member from speaking twice on the same question; while the practice of adjourning debates from night to night, extending them sometimes over several weeks, has become an intolerable nuisance, grievously wasting the time of Parliament, and seriously injuring the effectiveness of the discussions. During last session, this grievance reached an unprecedented height. Several adjourned debates were more than once depending at the same time; and the whole public business was disarranged, and postponed, in a manner destructive to the service of the country, and most pernicious from the disgust and contempt towards the proceedings of the House of Commons which were thereby generated in the minds of the community. For checking these great and yearly augmenting evils, the Speaker suggested, that all questions for adjournment made in the course of a debate—whether for the adjournment of the House or of the debate—should be decided *without discussion*; that a division on it—which occupies a considerable portion of time—should not be allowed, unless at least twenty-one members should stand up in their places and say "aye" to the motion; and that such motion, if negatived, should not again be repeated till after the lapse of one hour; while, for bringing adjourned debates finally to a close, he proposed, that a modified scheme, like the methods resorted to in the French Chambers and the United States' Congress, should be adopted. In the former, any member, or members, wishing the debate closed, call "*la clôture*,"

one member only of those objecting to this can be heard to speak against it, and none can speak in its favour; but the question is put without further discussion, "must the debate be closed?" and if that question be decided in the affirmative, the debate ceases, and the main question is put to the vote. In Congress, again, the same object is effected by means of what is termed the "previous question." This is very different from that which goes by the same name with us, and is simply this, "shall the main question be now put?" When this question is demanded, the Speaker inquires if it be "seconded," or supported, and all who concur in the demand rising, they are counted by the Speaker, who, if there be a majority in its favour, then puts this previous question, and if that pass in the affirmative, all debate ceases, and the questions on the amendments made, and on the bill before the House, are put without further debate. These methods are said to have worked well, and never to have been abused by the majority; but, unless somewhat modified, they could scarcely be adopted in our House of Commons without risk of surprises; the quorum of the House being only forty, and the residences of members so scattered and distant as to preclude their being speedily brought up on an unexpected motion to close the debate. The modification suggested by the Speaker was, that the motion for this purpose should only be competent at one specific period,—namely, before the order of the day for resuming an adjourned debate is read; and that it should not be actually carried into effect by a compulsory closing of the discussion, till two o'clock in the morning of the sitting at which the resolution to close may have been carried. His proposition was, that if the House should so agree to a resolution that the debate be not further adjourned, no member should be allowed to rise after two o'clock in the morning of that same sitting; at which hour, if not previously decided, the Speaker should put the question. If notice that such a motion was to be made on resuming an adjourned debate were required, nothing, we think, could be more reasonable and judicious than such a method of bringing a debate to a close; and we cannot doubt that it would greatly improve the character and spirit of the discussion, in addition to the immense saving in the time of the House, by compelling members to condense their speeches. The Speaker remarks, "I have frequently observed, that debates on Wednesdays," (on which day the House always rises at a fixed hour,) "when there happens to be an important question under discussion, (for instance, the debates of last session on Lord Ashley's Bill,) are remarkably good. Some of the best debates I have ever heard in the House have taken place on Wednesday's sitting, when every member was obliged to

“speak very shortly to enable the House to come to a decision upon the question.”

Neither of the Speaker's suggestions, however, whether as to adjournments, or the closing of debates, has been adopted by the Committee, who content themselves with recommending some useful enough, but comparatively immaterial changes, and also the waiver of the Commons' privileges, as to money clauses, in bills brought down from the Lords, so far as relates to certain pecuniary penalties or fees; and who chiefly rely “for the prompt and efficient despatch of business of the House,” upon “increased consideration on the part of members in the exercise of their individual privileges,” and, above all, “upon Her Majesty's Government, holding, as they do, the chief control over its management.”

We greatly fear that any reliance on the “increased consideration on the part of members” will prove altogether fallacious, unless matters be brought into such a state that their conduct will bring upon them a degree of odium, in reference to the opinion and feelings of the public as well as of the House, which could only be borne by men such as Mr. Chisholm Anstey. One of the drawbacks to the advantages derived from a more popular constituency is the greatly augmented desire, on the part of members, to exhibit themselves to their constituents as taking part in the discussions of the House; and, when circumstances favour, instead of repressing, the gratification of this very natural desire, it is not to be wondered at that the utmost possible advantage should be taken of these. Now, in the first place, the enormous extent of Committee business, which occupies so many members during the whole of the forenoon, produces this, among other injurious results, that the House is always very thin for the first four or five hours after it meets. Till ten o'clock, the attendance is so limited, that the leaders and chief speakers seldom address the House; and the consequence is, that many members who would not venture to compete for the eye of the Speaker with men of qualifications and authority universally acknowledged, seize with eagerness the opportunity, so constantly in this way offered them, of showing off in the eyes of their constituents, by speeches which, though spoken to empty benches, make as good an appearance in the newspapers as if addressed to a crowded House; and thereafter others of the same grade, in order not to appear behind, feel themselves subjected to a necessity of forcing themselves on the House, so as inevitably to lead to repeatedly renewed adjournments of the debate, before those members can be heard to whom the House and the country look for really discussing the question. To a certain extent it is not undesirable that such opportunities should be

given, but as matters go on at present, nearly half of the time during which the House sits for public business is lost, and there seems no prospect of a remedy, unless Parliament would consent to transfer to some other and more suitable tribunal a great deal of the business which calls for the morning labour of so many Committees. We are convinced that the rights of the lieges, so far as regards the subjects of railways, roads, the division of commons, and other matters of a like nature, could scarcely be in worse hands than those of a Committee of the House of Commons; but we have no hope whatever that they will give up their hold of these branches of their legislative power by subjecting them to the control of a judicial tribunal; and so we must continue to submit to the evils which result from their engrossing more business than they can possibly perform with a due regard to the service of the public and the State.

In the second place, however, the main encouragement to the practice of undue and unnecessary speechifying, on the part of individual members, arises from the circumstance that Government does not so conduct the public business of the country as to force them to feel, and enable the community clearly to see, that such parties are the real and true obstacles to the progress of measures which the wellbeing of the nation requires. If Government, at an early period of every session, were to introduce measures of national importance, fitted to excite the interest and cordial sympathy of the public, taking due care to have them reduced into the form of Bills well considered and thoroughly prepared, giving the House also to understand that they were determined to press through all that they introduced, and introducing only such as they were resolved to carry, unless rejected by the House,—instead of, as at present, bringing forward a number, of which it is well known that a half or a third will by and bye be abandoned,—and then actually urging them on with the constancy, energy, and resolution of men really in earnest, the obstruction offered by inconsiderate and useless speech-making, and factious motions of adjournment, would not be endured either by the country or the House. Members tempted to offer such obstruction would be borne down by an overwhelming force of public opinion, as well as by a consciousness of the mischief they were effecting, and the odium they would inevitably incur in the eyes even of their own constituents; and we should have no fear of Government being compelled, as at present, to drop measure after measure, to such an extent that the Legislature, at the end of the session, looks like a blighted tree with its fruit, in all stages of growth, strewing the ground beneath it, and only a few scattered here and there on the branches, which have been allowed to ripen. As it is, however, they allow the early part of the session

to pass without any important business being introduced; then they come down with a multitude of measures ill digested and ill prepared; these they are obliged to delay or postpone, in order to amend or reconstruct them; they know they cannot carry them all, and they hesitate and vacillate as to which they will press, and which they will keep back; they lose courage as to important measures which excite opposition, and shirk questions which they fancy may be hazardous to their tenure of office; the public business ceases to make progress, and the main cause of this lies so obviously with the Government itself, that no one feels any scruple, or has cause to feel scruple, at occupying unreasonably the time of the House, because it is impossible to allege that even though he did not, the business of the nation would have been at all more advanced. The protraction and delay may so clearly be traced to the way in which the Government conducts that business, that others are freed from responsibility, and are screened from an odium which they would not venture to encounter; and we conceive that the Committee might have expressed themselves even in stronger terms than they do, in the concluding paragraph of their Report, in which they say, "They believe that by the careful preparation of measures, their early introduction, the judicious distribution of business between the two Houses, and the order and method with which measures are conducted, the Government can contribute in an essential degree to the easy and convenient conduct of business."

One of the means enumerated in this extract for promoting the despatch of public business—namely, its judicious distribution between the two Houses—involves considerations still more important than even that of effecting the object immediately in view. It is, in itself, a grievous evil, and attaches disgrace to the Governments through whose fault the spectacle is presented, that the House of Lords, a branch of our Legislature well fitted to render the most essential services to the country, should, session after session, be held up to the scorn of the public as utterly useless, and should be treated as if it were unworthy to be trusted with any real share in the work of legislation. For at least three-fourths of the session this House is compelled to meet, day by day, with no business of the slightest moment to perform; and after sitting a few minutes, and listening, it may be, to an extravaganza of Lord Brougham, to adjourn till the morrow; while during the latter portion of it they are inundated with bills brought up from the Commons, which it is utterly impossible they can properly consider, or render any effective aid in bringing to perfection; so that they are reduced to the dilemma of either acting simply and merely as a registering chamber to record the bills

of the Commons, or—if they attempt to perform their functions as a branch of the Legislature—of obstructing the public business, and of postponing to another session measures which the necessities of the country urgently require to be passed. The whole blame of this sad and shameful exhibition lies on the Government of the day. As the legislation of the country is now, of necessity, carried on, almost all public measures must originate with the Government. Private members of the Legislature cannot hope to carry such through. They cannot be expected to make the attempt, and would not succeed if they did. On the other hand, the assistance of the Lords is of the utmost value in perfecting the hastily considered bills which are often passed through the Commons in their original crude state; and in certain branches of legislation—as, for instance, that of legal reforms, which is as extensive as it is important—the House of Lords is peculiarly fitted for taking the lead. That a great saving in the time of Parliament would be secured, and superior legislation attained, would alone be a sufficient reason for ministers introducing a due proportion of their measures in the House of Lords; but they are under a still stronger obligation to do so in order to preserve to that House the respect of the nation, and its proper position as a co-equal branch of the Legislature. If a ministry hostile to the aristocracy, or opposed to the existence of a Second Chamber, were to seek for the means by which they could bring the peerage into contempt with the country, and effect the ultimate abolition of the House of Lords, they could not find a method of accomplishing their purpose more certain of success than the system which for some years has been pursued towards that House; and it is utterly inconceivable to us how men really and sincerely attached to that part of our Constitution should allow any considerations to lead them to follow a course of conduct so injurious, or, indeed, so fatal to its continued usefulness and existence. We sincerely trust it will no longer be persevered in, and that, in the ensuing session, a change of practice will be introduced, essential alike to the proper disposal of the business of the country, and to the maintenance of our Constitution in all its integrity, which can only be effected by realizing the practical utility and value of every portion of it.

Of the subjects to which the attention of Parliament will chiefly be directed during this session, that of Financial Reform will, in all likelihood, excite the greatest interest, as it will certainly occupy the longest time. It is not a subject which can be concentrated into one discussion, and be disposed of by the vote on one question. Every committee of supply, and each separate item of the estimates, presents an opportunity for debat-

ing its general principles, or applying them to particular branches of the expenditure; and although the policy of the advocates of this growing cause will lead them to avoid, as much as possible, the risk of its being frittered down into fragments, and disposed of piecemeal, in questions of detail, the discussion must necessarily extend over a much larger space than that on any single definite measure, such as the abolition of the Corn Laws.

This subject has been of late far too much overlooked, and it has never at any time been treated in Parliament in a broad, comprehensive, and general way. It seems now likely to be dealt with in such a way, and with an earnestness corresponding to its vast importance. The state of our finances is itself sufficiently serious, and when viewed with reference to the fearful calamities which embarrassed finances scarcely ever fail to bring upon a nation, it is truly appalling. The existing evils of the restraints upon our trade—the repression of our industrial energies, and the burden on our people,—which result from the excessive taxation of this country, are sufficiently grievous; while, if we anticipate any events which might permanently diminish our national income, or still farther increase our national expenditure, such as an inevitable war—on the probability of the occurrence of which the opponents of the Financial Reform movement found their resistance to any effective reduction in our existing naval and military establishments—we must also anticipate the *risk*, at least, of a national bankruptcy, with all the fearful confusions, convulsions, and confiscation of property, which such an event would inevitably involve.

A great reduction in our expenditure is imperatively required.* Sad experience, however, has taught, that neither the Government, of whatever party composed, nor the Legislature, will, of their own accord, effect the necessary retrenchment and economy, unless compelled by the people. The people, therefore, must themselves take the matter in hand, and they are now preparing to do so with a zeal, determination, and unanimity, which cannot fail to prove successful. Mr. Cobden, whose persevering energies in forming and directing the Anti-Corn Law League, accomplished so great and wonderful a victory as that which crowned its efforts, has put himself at the head of a similar combination, of which the object is “to reduce the public expenditure to, at least, the standard of 1835, and to secure a more equitable and economical system of taxation.” In his addresses, Mr. Cobden refrains from entering into detail in reference to the particular items on which a saving should be effected. This course is at all events judicious, with a view to the success of his scheme of agitation. The great body of the classes whose support he must gain in order to carry

the object proposed, would not listen with interest to lengthened statements of minute details in all the branches of the public service, nor could they be expected to form any strong or clear opinion as to each separate article. Neither is it necessary that they should. They can perfectly understand this:—that the country cannot afford to provide for the present amount of expenditure, and that, in point of fact, the public service was carried on, not many years since, for £10,000,000 less than it costs now. It is the privilege of the nation to determine how much they can and will spend, and they are perfectly competent to decide this, leaving it to the Government to prepare the scheme for applying the amount most beneficially for the service of the country. It would be idle folly in the leaders of a great movement like this, to fritter away their strength in separate attacks on a thousand separate items, instead of concentrating their whole strength for an assault on the grand extravagance of the country's expenditure—namely, that branch of it which includes four-fifths of the whole—the military establishment, whether by land or sea.

In meeting this assault in Parliament, all parties will, doubtless, in general terms, acknowledge the necessity of economy and retrenchment; and the Government, we may be satisfied, will actually effect a number of praiseworthy reductions in matters of detail and of administration, which, though presenting a long list in enumeration, will exhibit a comparatively small sum total in the amount saved, certainly far within what the necessities of the country and the state of its finances require. But we have no hope that they will go further, or that they will make any approach to the standard of 1835, which has been suggested, and we doubt not will be generally adopted, as that for reducing our present expenditure, to which the efforts of the people should be directed. It is said, indeed, that this is altogether an arbitrary standard, and that the expenditure of 1792, or of any other year, might just as well be fixed on. But it is impossible, in this way, to evade the force of the facts, that the service of the State was efficiently performed at an expenditure by ten millions less than that of last year, so recently as 1835, and that the country is now in nearly the same condition as then; no event or change of circumstances having occurred which can, by possibility, warrant an increase of expenditure so great as that from £44,422,000 to £54,596,000. It may be that the economy of that period was not in all respects the most judicious with reference to particular branches, but making every allowance on this account, its expenditure must at least have very nearly approximated to the amount which was necessary for the public service. The country has, it is true, since then

increased in population; but this ought to involve merely an increase in the expenditure in its civil service; whereas the augmentation has been almost entirely on the branches of the military service. It is, indeed, the expenditure on this service alone which presents room for a reduction of such probable amount as to excite any strong interest in the people at large, or to afford any sensible relief from their burdens. The whole civil service costs about six millions, while the expense of the military service (including in this the army, navy, and ordnance) is £18,502,000, a sum above the amount (£18,024,000) which provided for every branch of the public service, civil and military, in 1830, when the Duke of Wellington's Administration was turned out, by the party now in power, on a formal vote condemnatory of its extravagance. In 1835 the expense of the military service was £11,657,000, the increase since that date having been about seven millions. Now what has occasioned the necessity for such an increase, or imposes the necessity of continuing to maintain it? The standing justification of an extensive navy, and a large army, is rested on the risk of war, and the importance of preventing attacks on the part of other nations, by showing how well prepared we are to repel them. Now, we admit the paramount importance of the defence of the country to every other consideration, but we deny that the risks of war have increased since 1835, or that it is the existence of large military establishments which will deter hostile nations from provoking a quarrel with us. The probability of war, indeed, we rejoice to think, has greatly diminished since that period. Not only has the desire for peace between nation and nation gained strength, but occasions of war have been removed out of the way. The expulsion of the Orleans dynasty from France has, of itself, relieved us of the only cause of dispute which was likely to arise between that country and this, in connexion with the eventual succession to the throne of Spain; and the recent revolutions throughout Europe have, for the future, excluded those fruitful sources of war which spring from personal or dynastic ambition, or the family rights and interests of sovereigns, to which so many of the former European wars must be traced. Other nations also are, for the present, and indeed are likely for a long while to be, too entirely engrossed with their own internal affairs to quarrel with us, unless we should attempt to interfere with them in the regulation of these. No one seriously believes that any of the nations of Europe will be mad enough to attack us; and groaning, as we do, under the fearful burden of the debt incurred in our attempt to prevent the French nation from choosing their own form of government, and afterwards to compel them to give up the ruler

whom they had themselves elected, and whose natural heir they have now seated in his place, we surely will not be mad enough again to engage in a similar contest with any nation. But even if there were more risk than we believe there is, of being embroiled with foreign powers, so as to render it wise to maintain a position which will deter them from assailing us, we deny altogether that it is the existence of extensive armaments kept up during peace which will, in this way, secure us against war. Our safety from attack must mainly depend on our national spirit, courage, and determination—the extent of our resources, and a financial condition capable of providing the means of a prolonged contest. The mere existence of an immense army and navy will not deter another nation from going to war with us, if they believe that our resources are inadequate to furnish our armaments with the necessary means of action, and that our national spirit is not such as will bear us up amid the difficulties and dangers of a lengthened contest; while the knowledge that we are strongly imbued with such a spirit, and that we possess abundant resources, will, even of themselves, create such a wholesome respect, as to check the temptation to seize any temporary advantage that might be at the outset of a war secured, in consequence of the limited extent of the armament actually kept up in time of peace. Of the truth of this remark, America affords a pregnant proof. With a navy much inferior in extent to that of France or that of Britain, she maintains a tone and position at least as confident as either of them, and is treated with a respectful observance—showing that she is as secure from encroachments as nations with armaments of far greater magnitude. Indeed, an excessive military force constantly kept up as a burden on a country, may, by crippling its finances, actually incite to the very attack which the dread of it is intended to avoid.

It is said, however, that besides the necessity of being prepared for actual war, a large armament is essential to the maintenance of our proper *influence* in European politics. We really do not know that it is now-a-days of much importance to this country that her Government should exercise a great influence in European politics; but whatever influence it may be desirable they should exercise a country like this cannot fail to possess, irrespective of the extent to which she keeps up her army and navy, if her relations with other countries be but conducted with wisdom, in a friendly as well as firm spirit, and with due respect to them; while, if conducted otherwise, and especially if our diplomacy be marked with an unwarranted intermeddling in their domestic affairs, we can only look for hatred, disregard of our advice, and a resolution to thwart us in every direction. Nothing

can show more clearly how unavailing a mere extent of force is to maintain the influence which is thereby sought to be preserved, than the present state of our relations with the continental powers. Our naval and military force has never been so great in time of peace, and we have largely employed it in demonstrations over all the world in order to back our diplomacy; but scarcely at any time has our real influence been more contemptible than at the present moment. We have miserably failed in every object we have attempted; we have been subjected to slights and insults which would have been appropriate to the times of James I. or Charles II.; and our only relief from general contempt is, that we are hated even more than we are scorned. It is worse than idle to plead the importance of maintaining our diplomatic influence in Europe as a reason for keeping up an extravagant armament in time of peace; and, indeed, one great collateral benefit which may be expected to result from a reduction in our military establishments would be, that our Government would be less inclined to interfere in the disputes between nation and nation, or between the people of other countries and their rulers.

The great contest in the question of retrenchment will necessarily be as to the *extent* of the army and navy. That much may be saved by the introduction of greater economy into the details of the administration of these establishments, is true; but important as it is that such economy should not be overlooked, the great object is a reduction in the amount of the force, without which nothing in the way of retrenchment can be effected which will admit of any material relief to the nation. It is, indeed, highly satisfactory to observe that there is no appearance of any tendency to cut down the pay, whether of officers or men, below a fair and proper remuneration for their services. No one would propose for a moment to deprive the soldier of those provisions for his comfort and improvement which have been recently introduced under the superintendence of the present excellent Secretary-at-War, who, with kind-hearted and enlightened sympathy, has made so good a commencement in the attempt to raise the condition of the men in the ranks of our army. On the contrary, the people of this country would, we are persuaded, willingly see these provisions added to, and the allowances of the soldier and sailor made such as absolutely to supersede, in the army, the revolting arts of the recruiting service, and in the navy, the atrocious and cruel tyranny of the system of impressment. The country fully appreciates the merits of her gallant navy and army. She does not grudge, and will not refuse, a full remuneration for whatever services she really requires, but she will not submit to the burden of a permanent

armament in time of peace, far beyond what she can afford, or what is necessary for her protection.

Eminently desirable and important, however, though it be, that the utmost possible reduction should be effected in our expenditure, it is impossible to keep out of view the depressing and discouraging fact, that out of the fifty-four millions which the nation pays annually, twenty-eight millions are required to defray the interest on the national debt, and that while that debt exists, this immense proportion of our expenditure must be excluded from the amount on which any retrenchment can be attempted. This consideration is apt to generate a feeling of hopelessness, which would nearly amount to despair, if we were in the habit of dwelling much on the subject. We have, however, been so long accustomed to our debt, that while we can never cease to be sensible of the *burden* of it, we have nearly lost sight of the *danger* which attends its continued subsistence. Yet no one who seriously thinks of the subject, and contemplates the not improbable occurrence of events which would produce still greater embarrassments in our finances than any we have yet experienced, can avoid a feeling of alarm at the almost certain consequences, of which the most immediate—the violation of the national faith—though that most to be condemned and deplored, would scarcely be the most fearful. As yet, the determination to maintain that faith with the public creditor is universal among all the respectable classes of society; but it will not stand the pressure to which, in the lapse of time, it must inevitably be exposed; and if the national creditor be once despoiled, the proprietor will not stand secure. We earnestly wish that men would bring themselves to look steadfastly in the face the danger the country is exposed to by the existence of a national debt, which is felt to be intolerably oppressive—which fetters the energies of the country—restricts her trade—obstructs her in the march of internal improvement—exposes her to assaults from abroad, and keeps her ever on the brink of anarchy and confusion at home. If they did, we should not absolutely despair of their deliberately considering some plan for effecting that which at present will seem the wild project of an extravagant dreamer—the payment of the debt; but which, we believe, would prove the only safeguard against ultimate national bankruptcy or repudiation, and all its attendant consequences.

Looking at the nation simply in its corporate character, no diminution in its wealth would result from effecting such a payment. The expenditure, so far as the nation is concerned, has already taken place. This consisted in the destruction and consumption of stores and munitions of war, the exportation of

bullion, and, generally, the whole expenses incurred during our former wars. The loss took place then. To meet that loss, the State borrowed the funds of individual members of the community, to whom, or those in their right, it still owes the amount. In repaying that debt, the nation would not require to destroy any further wealth, nor, as in the case of China in the payment of the ransom to this country, to take out of the realm any portion of its property. The transaction would consist in the *transference* of property from one class of the community to another class of the community,—from the owners of property (among whom the creditors would so far be themselves ranked) to these creditors, almost exclusively members of the national body. The operation would be purely internal; and so far as the nation, in its corporate capacity is concerned, the result would be one of advantage as unqualified as it was great. Taxes to the amount of twenty-eight millions a year would be at once repealed, thus relieving the country from a fearful burden, and placing it in a position of commanding power to commence a new career of glorious prosperity and advancement, freed from the crushing weight which now represses all its energies and impedes its every movement. The burden would fall on the *individual* proprietors of the nation, but that would be counterbalanced to a greater extent than will generally be supposed. At present, so far as regards the national debt, every owner of property is in the situation of a man whose estate is under mortgage, and liable for a certain amount of yearly interest. That interest is levied in the shape of taxes, and if the taxes to pay the interest of the debt were all imposed upon the owners of property alone, the appropriation of such a proportion of that property as was necessary to pay off the debt, would simply be the redemption of a mortgage, or the buying up of an annual rent charge. This, however, is not the case. A large portion of the taxes levied for this purpose is raised on articles of consumption, from the labouring and trading population, on whom it would be impossible to lay a share of the debt. Still, though the proprietor paid more than the fair purchase-money of the taxes from which he would be relieved, he would obtain an ample consideration for this in the state of security to which he would thereby attain; and, besides, no one can attend to the tendency of public opinion at present, without seeing that proprietors will ere long, if the debt continue, have to submit to a much larger portion of the taxation necessary for the payment of the interest of that debt than they at present bear. The whole real property of the kingdom may be taken in round numbers at 2300 millions, and the personal property at 2200 millions, in all 4500 millions. Stating the debt at 800 millions, it would require nearly one-fifth of the whole property of the kingdom to pay it. Each man would have

to sacrifice that proportion of his estate or realized funds; but, as the sacrifice would be made by all, each would hold the same relative place which he occupied before, and in addition to his direct relief from taxation, he would also participate in the general prosperity of the country, which would rise with a buoyant spring on the removal of the weight which has so long pressed down its energies.

A natural feeling would doubtless arise that the debt incurred by a former generation might still be handed over to that which is to succeed, and that the existing generation cannot in justice be called upon to provide the capital of a debt, in the contraction of which they had no concern. But the question to be considered by the present race of proprietors, is, whether their own interest, safety, and security do not require all the sacrifice they would be called upon to make. Many, it is true, would be under the necessity of selling portions of their property, but the creditors who were paid off would require investments for their funds, and by coming into the market would prevent an undue depreciation; while a separate and collateral advantage would result in the division of estates, and the augmentation of the number of proprietors of land. While the process of incurring the greater portion of the debt was going on, another process was keeping pace with it, by which the number of separate properties was reduced to an extent that seems almost incredible. It is calculated that during the half century which preceded the peace of 1815, the land of England, previously parcelled out among 250,000 families, came to be held by only thirty-two thousand; and it would not be the least of the benefits attending the repayment of the debt, that the process would be reversed, and the basis of proprietorship again extended.

A proposal to pay off the national debt will, as we have said, seem utterly wild, but it will appear so only because no one imagines that the owners of property could evince such courage, patriotism, and self-denial, as to submit to a sacrifice which, looking to the actual relief from taxation it would purchase, could not be deemed very extravagant, while it would save their country—launch it on a new career of augmented prosperity, and secure themselves and their children from dangers of no light kind, and no improbable occurrence, should this burden be allowed to lie on the nation till its galling oppressiveness and a convulsive effort to get rid of it issue in revolution, confiscation, and anarchy. Meanwhile, it is the duty of all to seek to obtain whatever amount of relief is practically attainable, and we trust, that, though the combined efforts now commenced may not achieve much during this session of Parliament, these will ultimately accomplish results well worth the struggling for.

Another subject of equal urgency with Financial Reform, and of far greater difficulty, which will press early on the attention of Parliament, is the condition of Ireland, with reference especially to the working of the Poor Law, now producing there such momentous results. When a compulsory provision for the able-bodied poor was first introduced into Ireland, in opposition to the deliberate opinion of the able and intelligent Commissioners who had spent three years in investigating the state of the country with reference to that question, it was on a scale so limited that its enactment could only be looked on as preliminary to the extension which has since taken place; or, if no such extension was contemplated, as having for its object some collateral and incidental advantage, such as the establishment of some universal rating which might serve as a means of testing the qualification for enrolment of voters for members of Parliament. It was obvious, however, to all who had considered the tendencies of such a Poor Law once introduced in connexion with the state of the Irish population, that, with whatever intension originated, it would inevitably advance with the fearfully rapid strides which have, in point of fact, characterized its progress. The machine so set up was of capacity sufficient to drain off the whole produce of the country;—the amount of unemployed population destitute of all self-dependence afforded a power capable of ultimately working it to the utmost extent of its capacity; and even already, a point has been reached which places the lauded property of Ireland on the very brink of confiscation.

In some places one-fifth of the population are on the poor's roll; rates of five, seven, and ten shillings, in the pound, are frequent, and in one Union, as stated last session by the Chancellor of Exchequer, the amount had reached nineteen shillings and sixpence, so that a rate in aid out of the public revenue of the empire was required and voted. These rates, too, are largely in arrear; the attempt to levy them has been resisted, and the aid of a military force has been required in more than one instance, so that the poor-rate threatens to take the place formerly occupied by the tithe prior to the Commutation Act;—the peasantry in large numbers are throwing up their plots of ground and farms, that they may pass over from the rate-paying to the rate-consuming class;—the gentry are approaching fast to a state of bankruptcy;—many have been obliged to abandon their residences, which have, in several instances, been turned into supplemental poor's-houses for those who are now the true beneficiaries in the estates;—others have been compelled to give up the improvements on their own estates which they had previously been in use to carry on, but which the abstraction of so large a portion of their income, in the shape of poor's-rates, prevents them from

further prosecuting ;—dread and alarm pervade all classes above that composed of the recipients of relief, while the misery of the mass of the population appears to be as intense and as widespread as ever.

Nothing can be more striking than the complete falsification of the views on which the introduction into Ireland of a Poor Law for the able-bodied was attempted to be justified. The foundation on which it was rested was the assumption, that such was the horror of the Irish for confinement, that the mere terror of the workhouse would operate as a stimulus to support themselves sufficient to effect that object. Mr. Nicholls, whom Lord John Russell employed to make a three months' ~~scamper~~ *scamper* over Ireland in order to overthrow the report—the result of three years' inquiry and deliberation—of the Royal Commissioners appointed by the Government of which he was a member, and on whose judgment the original Poor Law was based, seemed to consider that the dread of "workhouse discipline" would accomplish what starvation discipline could not effect ; overlooking this, that even if the Irish viewed confinement in a workhouse with more terror than starvation itself, neither the one nor the other could provide work which was not to be had. The Commissioners had reported that there "were out of work and in distress during thirty weeks in the year" no less than 585,000 persons, with 1,800,000 others dependent on them, making, in all, not under 2,385,000 ; and they justly observed, that "the difficulty in Ireland is not to make the able-bodied look for employment, but to find it profitably for the many who seek it." Mr. Nicholls, however, and the Government who acted on his opinion, full of the notion that the stimulus which answered in England, where, in general, the willing worker can find work, would answer in Ireland, where the grand want was the want of work, which no stimulus could supply, fancied that the sight of a workhouse and the apprehension of workhouse discipline were all that was needed. It is obvious, that even had the stimulus of the workhouse been more powerful with the Irish than the stimulus of starvation, which was in full operation previously, it never could have enabled them to find work when "work there was not for them." But what has experience shown even as to the assumed dread of the workhouse ? So far from being shunned, the workhouses of Ireland are actually besieged for admission. Buildings erected to contain 1000 inmates are crammed with upwards of 3000, and enlargements, or supplemental houses, are everywhere in progress.

Again, it was assumed, that the necessary result of the introduction of a Poor Law for the able-bodied would be, that the landed proprietors, in order to keep down the rates, would afford

employment to the labouring population in the improvement of their estates. This was to be the *stimulus* to the landlords, as the dread of workhouse discipline was to be the *stimulus* to the destitute; and it was relied on with equal confidence as certain to produce a complete transformation in Ireland, and to bring about that healthful state of full natural employment to which alone, as Mr. Nicholls truly remarks, "the labourers of a country can look for permanent occupation, and the means of support." But what has been the result? Why, that not only have none been thus stimulated to provide employment, but that numbers of those proprietors who had been in use to do so, have been compelled to give up the further improvement of their estates, and to dismiss the labourers employed by them, being unable to pay both wages and the enormous poor's-rates to which they are subjected.

This, however, was exactly the result which *ought* to have been looked for. Even if the estates of the Irish gentry had been altogether unencumbered, the exaction of a fifth, a fourth, or a half of their rental, for poor's-rates, was not likely to lead to increased expenditure in the improvement of these; but in the embarrassed condition of the greater part of the proprietors, the diversion of a much smaller proportion of their income must, in most cases, have absolutely precluded the possibility of their undertaking any expenditure for this purpose. Besides, in general they could reap no advantage, in the shape of relief from rates, by any extent of employment given by them to the labouring population on their own properties. Even had the parishes all constituted separate rateable divisions, there would be very few in which there would not be found one or more proprietors who provided no employment, and whose population would consequently fall to be supported by the rates; and, of course, the other proprietors could not be expected both to employ their own people, and to pay rates for the support of those whose landlords would not, or could not, provide employment for theirs. But as if to exclude the possibility of this motive, on which the advocates of the law so strongly rested, being operative to any extent, the rateable divisions generally embrace several parishes, all included in one union, and so extensive that, in no case, can a proprietor hope, in any sensible degree, to diminish the rate by whatever extent of employment it may be in his power to provide. The present Poor Law, instead of operating as a stimulus to the creation of natural employment, presents an almost insuperable barrier to its extension, and tends greatly to limit that which was previously provided.

Finally, it was confidently anticipated that the introduction of the Poor Law into Ireland would stay the stream of mendicancy.

cancy which poured over the whole surface of Britain such a flood of Irish paupers. But instead of this, that flood rolls on even more copiously than before; so threatening to lower and degrade our own population, as to lead men almost seriously to entertain the idea of permitting a repeal of the Union, that we might the more easily erect some effective barrier against its overwhelming and destructive torrent.

All parties seem agreed that matters cannot be allowed to remain as they are; but the changes as yet suggested seem to us little calculated to supply the defects or redress evils so universally acknowledged.

The two principal alterations which have been advocated in Ireland are,—1. The diminution of the areas of taxation, by taking for this purpose, the parishes or electoral divisions, instead of the unions; and, 2. The extension of the fund from which the provision for the poor is to be drawn.

1. Now, as to the first of these proposed amendments, it is no doubt true that, in some cases, to a certain, though, we believe, to a comparatively limited extent, the change of the area of taxation, from the union to the parish or electoral division, would remove the obstruction now presented to the employment of labourers, in the improvement of their estates by liberal-minded proprietors who have funds at their command, by the certainty that no efforts of theirs, in this way, will sensibly diminish or even keep down the rate: but there is a practical bar to the adoption of such a measure, in the circumstance that in almost every union there are one or more parishes or divisions, the whole rental of which would not support their own poor. If, then, these were severed from the union, how would the destitute population be maintained? It was stated by the Chancellor of Exchequer last year, that in some parishes, if the rateable division were changed from the union to the parish, the sum required for the support of the poor would amount to greatly beyond the whole produce of the parish, amounting, in one case mentioned by him, to no less than forty-four shillings in the pound. How then could they be supported? If the principle of the Poor Law be, that every man is entitled to work or subsistence, they cannot be excluded from the benefit of that privilege, legally acknowledged to be the right of all. They must then be supported either by a rate in aid, or out of the public funds. A rate in aid would, however, be substantially the same thing as the present rate over the union; and a supplemental provision out of the public revenue, which would be a rate in aid over the kingdom at large, will not, we presume, be contemplated by any one, at least on this side of the Channel, as admissible. To a certain extent, indeed, such a supplemental provision was voted

by Parliament, last year, out of the general revenue ; but such a mode of supplying the wants of Ireland cannot be continued. The distribution of a general fund by local boards, and that too in Ireland, would insure the most reckless extravagance, and an eager struggling between the various parishes for the largest possible share of the spoil ; while the destitute population would expand with the amount granted, and is capable of exhausting far more than the funds of this country can possibly afford to pay. Besides, the people of England and Scotland will not submit permanently to bear the burden of maintaining the labouring population of Ireland. They nobly responded to her cry of distress under the providential visitation to which she has been subjected, but her ordinary destitution must be otherwise provided for.

2. The other mode of alleviating the burden now felt to be so oppressive, is by extending the fund from which the provision for the poor is drawn. It is proposed that moveable estate should be made liable to be rated as well as real estate. This is, and long has been, allowed in Scotland, and we readily acknowledge the justice of equalizing the burden, while it subsists, over all the holders of property whether personal or real. But although some relief would for the first year or so be thereby obtained, it would not be permanent. With three millions of a destitute population, and a capacity of indefinite increase, the demands would rapidly augment with the rateable fund, and in a wonderfully short time the rates would again reach, and then pass beyond their present point ; and ultimately the only result would be to involve the merchants, traders, and shopkeepers, in the same ruin with the landed proprietors.

That ruin is certainly advancing with rapid strides ; and the fearful evils which the domination of the ascendant body in Ireland has brought upon the people is now likely to meet with a fearful retribution, though not at the hands of those whom they have kept down and oppressed, but at those of the very Government whose predecessors were their abettors in the wrongs inflicted. A confiscation more gradual, indeed, but not less sure, than those of Henry, James, and Cromwell, is fast restoring to the descendants of the "mere Irish" the produce of the lands taken from their forefathers and bestowed upon the Saxon ; and if the present system go on for a few years longer, the greater portion of the rental of Ireland will be transferred to the body of the population. If the Government were deliberately seeking to reduce the whole inhabitants, rich and poor, proprietor and peasant, to one common level, that they might rear a totally new framework of society, they could not pursue a course more likely to effect the object ; and if the new erection were likely to secure

prosperity and happiness in future to that wretched land, we might possibly succeed in shutting our eyes to the immediate misery which must be suffered, and in thinking only of the retribution on an unpatriotic selfish race, and the regeneration of the people they had so long degraded and oppressed. No such prospect, however, can reasonably be entertained. The reduction of the whole population of Ireland to one common mass of pauperism would only the more certainly secure its perpetual degradation and poverty, and remove every element through the operation of which the people might be elevated.

Meanwhile that process is going on with alarming rapidity, and we know not how it can be stayed, so long as the English nation and its representatives continue to view with such infatuated favour their system of a Poor Law for the able-bodied,—to attribute to its operation all the results of the inherent independence and indomitable energy and industry of their people, and of the natural advantages of their country, and to look on it as the grand panacea for all the evils of every people, under whatever circumstances, and of whatever character. We had hoped that the exhibition of the real tendencies of the principle of that system which was presented to the world in France, immediately consequent on the recent Revolution, would have staggered men in their strange confidence in it; but with marvellous ingenuity or blindness, while condemning without qualification the steps attempted to be taken there for the permanent recognition of the “rights of labour,” they will not see that the principle there contended for, and for a time carried into operation, is identically the same principle with that on which the English Poor Law is rested. That principle is, that every man has a *right* to be provided with labour, or failing that, with subsistence. In France, its natural tendencies, and the results to which it inevitably leads, appeared more palpable, because it was introduced without any check, and in circumstances which at once gave free scope to its power. The provision of work to the unemployed was there to be made by the State directly, and out of the public revenue. All the streams of destitution were consequently drawn into one channel, and directed, with united and overwhelming force, against the central Government, by which the relief was to be administered. All moral restraint, too, was withdrawn, and the working population, instead of feeling it a degradation to be dependent on the means of others, looked on their right to labour or support as one, or the chief, of the objects for which they had effected the Revolution, and as the legitimate reward of their exertions and their triumph; while the destruction of credit, and the stoppage of all private enterprises, vastly augmented the masses whose wants had to be supplied, and con-

sequently the pressure on the Government. It soon became evident that an universal confiscation of property must inevitably result from the principle which had been recognised and put into operation. The only alternative was ruin, on the one hand, or the overthrow of this principle, on the other. After a fierce and bloody conflict, the friends of order and property triumphed,—the national workshops were closed, and the principle of the English Poor Law, which had wrought such wild mischief, and brought the nation to the brink of destruction, was solemnly negatived by the National Assembly, and refused to be admitted into the new constitution.

That it has not, as yet, fully developed its native tendencies in England, is owing in part to the character of the people, and in part to the practical checks which the mode of administration interposes. The English people are so strongly imbued with an instinct of active industry, and a spirit of personal self-dependence, that they have long resisted the adverse influences of their own Poor Law system. The administration, again, being parochial, the streams, which in France were collected into one channel, and directed against a common centre, are distributed into thousands of rills, the force and pressure of which are vastly lessened by division, while they are easily subjected to all the checks and obstructions which the local management provides. These restraints, however, are daily becoming less efficacious. The habit of energetic industry is, among large classes, giving way; while the avowed recognition of the principle of a right to employment or maintenance is going far, by the substitution of a false and bastard independence, founded on the notion that they are *entitled* to employment, or support, to supersede that true and noble self-dependence which scorns to live on the means of others, and which the mere *practice*, without the recognition of the *principle*, of the Poor Law so long failed to overcome. Accordingly, although the progress has been slow, the flood is constantly rising and advancing. The pressure on the checks interposed is daily becoming more severe; already the grand barrier—that of the workhouse-test—introduced by the Poor Law Amendment Act as the only means of saving the country from an ultimate state of universal pauperism, is yielding and breaking down; and we are compelled once more to watch the rise of those waters whose progress it was hoped had been stayed, but which must, by an inevitable law of nature, continue to advance, so long as the principle which the French, by a convulsive effort to save themselves from instant ruin, expelled, continues to be fostered and acted on.

In Ireland, the moral restraints which have operated so powerfully in England in checking the natural tendencies of the

principle of the Poor Law, have scarcely any existence, while the artificial obstructions have been to a great extent omitted. Partly from peculiarities of character which mark the race, but mainly from the circumstances in which, for generations, they have been placed, the Irish are without habits of permanent and steady industry, while they have scarcely any feeling of personal self-dependence which would make them rely exclusively on their own exertions for support. Kept under as a degraded race for ages,—all hope of raising themselves by their own efforts excluded,—the objects of a grinding oppression on the part of the dominant class, and with minds debased by an enslaving superstition, they have fallen into a state of degraded recklessness, and willingly abandon themselves to the condition of hopeless pauperism, which the Poor Law has legalized, and which holds out at least some prospect of maintenance at the cost of others, and without exertion on their own part. The population, too, thus constituted, has long been greatly in excess of the natural employment which the country provides; and, even subject to the artificial checks which exist in England, it would soon swallow up the whole rental of the land. But, as if to make matters worse, these have been, in a great measure, dispensed with by the Legislature. The rateable areas have been made much larger than in England, so as to increase the pressure; the administration has been made more central and less local, so as to diminish the resistance; while the great defence which was deemed necessary to secure England against being overwhelmed by a flood of pauperism—namely, the workhouse-test—has now been deliberately rejected as to Ireland, where it was so much more imperatively needed. Accordingly, during the short period for which the Poor Laws have existed in the latter country, the system has advanced with gigantic strides. The proportion of the population receiving relief, and of the rents absorbed in providing it, already far exceed that which has been reached in England. These, too, are increasing with alarming speed. The population is becoming more and more sunk in the apathetic dependence of permanent and hopeless pauperism. The rental of some unions has already been exhausted by the rates, and all are fast approaching to that state; while British capital, through which alone natural employment could be expected to be provided, is absolutely excluded by its subjection—in addition to all the previous risk of insecurity—to an indefinitely augmenting burden, to which it is impossible to see a limit short of the exhaustion of all it is capable of yielding. No sane man on this side of the channel, however enterprising, would lay out his funds in improving land in Ireland, under a state of things in which every pound of return he may create is liable to a rate of five, ten, or fifteen shillings, with a

not improbable prospect of being in a few years absorbed altogether. Even as regards the indirect and collateral advantages which are supposed to flow from a Poor Law for the able-bodied, Ireland is past the stage at which alone these could be available. Many who cannot stand up in defence of such a Poor Law with reference to its direct operation, still insist that, by its action on proprietors, leading them to prevent the erection of additional dwelling-houses on their lands, it tends to keep the population within the existing means of employment and subsistence. In truth, we believe that this action only effects the undue accumulation of masses in towns and villages, and creates such nests of physical and moral pollution and disease, as was lately held up to the view of the public in the case of Hilton Abbas; but, supposing it really would operate in the way supposed, where the population had not already become excessive in numbers, and thoroughly degraded in habits, the time for applying such a check in Ireland is gone. The population has been allowed to increase so far beyond the existing means of employment, that nothing but a wholesale extirpation of millions would reduce it within due limits; while their habits have been so utterly degraded, that restraints on the erection of dwelling-houses, however great, would never prevent marriage and increase, but would only drive a larger portion of them into lairs like those of the beasts of the field.

There is therefore no hope for Ireland so long as this system is maintained;—not that its removal would, in itself, positively and directly advance the improvement of the Irish people, but that it would take out of the way that which not only occupies the place of something better, and excludes it, but which operates as an insuperable barrier to the beneficial operation of every measure for their good. What then is to be done? Are the landlords to be relieved from the duties which property imposes on them, and the people to be left to unassisted misery and degradation? Assuredly not. This is not the only alternative; and, dark as the prospect is, there would be no reason to despair, if statesmen, instead of, with blind prejudice, applying to Ireland the systems which they fancy to have wrought well in England, under circumstances totally different, and in some respects opposite, would frame their remedies with some reference to the real condition and wants of Ireland itself, and the actual causes of its evils.

We have no desire to see the landlords of Ireland relieved from their proper duties as proprietors, or from any burdens for the benefit of the population which the long-continued neglect of these duties may have entailed upon them. The present state of that population is owing in a great measure to them and their

predecessors. As a dominant class—as an alien race—as, from absenteeism, withdrawn to a large extent from the influence of those feelings which lead proprietors to seek the elevation or improvement of the dwellers on their land, they have been removed from the operation of the motives and sympathies which so powerfully stimulate resident proprietors, under ordinary circumstances, to fulfil the duties that property imposes. These have, with some bright and noble exceptions, been for generations, and are still, shamefully neglected by the landlords of Ireland. It is but right that the State should step in, and either compel the performance of these, or, as it best can, itself accomplish them at their expense. We would spare the Irish landlords no burden for this purpose which would really conduce to the welfare of the people. At present, however, they are taxed and brought to the verge of bankruptcy only to render the degradation of the people more permanent and complete. We would not relieve them from all taxation for behoof of the labouring population, but we would make it just in amount and limited in duration, and apply its proceeds towards such improvements as a patriotic proprietary would voluntarily have undertaken and accomplished, and as will tend to advance a state in which sufficient natural employment would be furnished through the ordinary channels, while the labouring-classes were stimulated to industry, and elevated in habits and condition.

Till some progress has been made in bringing Ireland to the state in which it would have been had the proprietors done their duty, let there be an universal labour-rate there; but instead of its being, as at present, liable to an indefinite augmentation which threatens, ere long, to absorb the whole rental, let it be subjected to a reasonable limit which it shall in no case exceed. Then, instead of wasting the amount so raised, on the idle inmates of a workhouse, or on multitudes employed in some mockery of useless labour, invented as a test which it can scarcely ever answer, let it be appropriated to the execution of those classes of public improvements which would open up the resources of the country, and form new channels for future employment—such as main lines of communication—canals—river navigations—making available extensive sources of water power—the erection of fishing harbours, and the like. Then let these be executed, not in the shape of relieving paupers, at test or pauper work, but by going into the labour market in the ordinary way, and benefiting the mass of the community simply by withdrawing a portion of the competitors for private employment, and the parties employed, by the payment of wages fully earned by their own work and independent exertions. And further, let them be carried on, as far as may be, in co-operation with local

proprietors or associations, and at mutual expense in those cases where a special advantage is to be derived by these parties, as has been done, with such eminent success, by the Destitution Committee in Scotland, in conjunction with the Highland proprietors, particularly in Ross-shire. In this way, the general fund, in addition to the employment provided, and the reproductive improvements effected, would stimulate largely an additional outlay by individual proprietors, whose interest would also lead to a more economical and efficient administration. Beyond this, the extensive improvable wastes now in the hands of proprietors who cannot or will not reclaim them, should be acquired by the State, by compulsory sale, under some such scheme as was contained in the bill introduced in the session before last, but then abandoned; and after the first great operations towards their improvement were effected, these should be subdivided and resold, in such a shape and at such terms as might induce men of some capital to undertake their complete improvement and cultivation, and so form a new race of valuable landowners. In the prosecution of the same object, additional facilities should be largely given for the sale of encumbered estates, for removing the fetters of entails, and simplifying tenures and conveyances,—and for, in every way, promoting the transfer of properties from the hands of those who are unable to perform the duties of proprietors, into the hands of others who could do justice to their estates, give employment to the labouring-classes in improving these, and increase the amount of agricultural produce drawn from the soil. By such means a wide door would be opened for that which is so important to the future welfare of Ireland—an influx of British capital, to make available the vast resources of that fertile land, so rich in soil, and so abundant in the means of manufacturing and commercial wealth. But to effect this, one additional requisite is absolutely essential—namely, security; and while security to life and property is essential to induce the British capitalist to transfer his capital to Ireland, security to the peasant and cultivator of the ground, that he shall certainly reap the benefits of his labour and his outlay upon it, is as essential in order to lay a foundation for elevating the character and condition of the great body of the people.

These two things are very nearly allied. As long as the peasant has no confidence in the law, and in the existing constitution of society securing to him the fruits of his exertions and outlay, he will not only continue in a state of apathetic inaction and indolence, but he will, whenever he deems himself wronged, seek to right himself at his own hand. The peasantry of Ireland are without such confidence, and so long as they continue in this state, there can be no sufficient security to life and

property among the classes above them, or among any classes by whom they may feel or fancy they are wronged. The very first step, therefore, towards giving security to life and property, and so rendering the investment of capital in Ireland safe, is to provide security to the peasant, and give him confidence in that security. Now his present want of confidence, and, we will also say, of security, arises from two separate causes. *First*, the nature of the tenure by which the land is generally possessed by the peasant; and, *Second*, the administration of the law, in the class of matters and transactions with which he is chiefly cognisant.

As to the first of these, he almost universally holds his land at the will of the landlord, except in Ulster, where tenant right prevails, and where a security to life and property unknown elsewhere in Ireland, together with a much better condition, owing to various causes on which we cannot enter here, are found. Improve it as he may, he is liable at any time to be turned out or to have his rent raised. He has no security, he can have no security, that he will reap the fruits of whatever labour or outlay he may expend in making the land possessed by him more productive. He has not even the reliance, doubtful as that is, which the kindly feelings of a resident proprietor afford, for he has generally to deal with a middleman or agent, whose sole duty and object is to extract as large a rent as possible from the unhappy tenant. In such a state of matters, the peasant is deprived of all stimulus to exertion or improvement, and, crushed down as the whole class have been for ages, they are without that hope of bettering their condition by their own efforts, and raising themselves in the social scale, which is the great spring of industry, the indispensable pre-requisite to attaining a habit of self-dependence. The very first step, therefore, towards making a beginning in the process of lifting them from the degradation into which they have fallen, is to afford them a security, on which they can confidently rely, that if they, by their own exertions, labour, and outlay, improve the value of the land possessed by them as tenants, they shall reap a reasonable return; and that the whole profits shall not fall to the landlord, or even be exposed to the risk of being appropriated by him.

To provide such security was the object of a bill recently introduced, but like many other similar measures, abandoned, by which it was proposed to be enacted, that tenants should be entitled to possess at the existing rent, until remunerated for improvements effected by them on the land. The details and regulations of the measure, however, were so complicated, and would have proved so troublesome, and given rise to so much litigation, that no practical good could have been looked for

from it; and assuredly it was not of a character calculated to have given the tenant such assurance of recovering the value of his ameliorations, as to lead him to venture on any outlay, or even to expend much labour, in improving his ground. Nor indeed, we fear, could any measure of this kind be so framed as to be practically available, and to give that confidence without which no object of any importance will be attained. A much more simple and unequivocal measure is absolutely necessary; and unwilling as we are that the free power and discretion of a landlord in letting his own land should be interfered with, we conceive that the peculiar circumstances of Ireland, arising in so large a measure from the neglect of the proprietors themselves, would warrant a temporary interposition of the Legislature, to effect the first upward movement in the elevation of the peasantry—to give the primary impulse to that stimulus which alone will raise them from their present state of degradation.

What, therefore, we would suggest is this: that all the present possessors of land to a certain specified extent, excluding the very smallest holdings, should be entitled to continue to possess, at the subsisting rent, for some definite space of time,—say for ten, or possibly fourteen years, subject, of course, to removal, by an easy and summary process, on failure to pay the rent. No doubt, considerable inconvenience would, in many cases, arise from such a general measure, which would in substance be the creation of a universal leasehold tenure for the next ten or fourteen years, instead of the present tenancy at will; but this would be far more than counterbalanced by the benefits. The tenants would have a motive for exertion which they do not now possess; they would entertain a hope of bettering themselves to which they have long been strangers, and which would give a new spring to their existence; and they would enjoy an actual security calculated to inspire confidence, and to remove that distrust whence so many evils flow.

The other subject in regard to which it is essential to give the peasant security and confidence, is the administration of the law in those matters in reference to which he is chiefly brought into contact with it. Now, as regards these matters, the law is almost exclusively administered by the Justices of Peace in their Petty and Quarter Sessions. These Justices, however, consist, with few exceptions, of that very dominant class whom the peasantry look on as their oppressors and natural enemies, from whom also they chiefly suffer the wrongs, for redress of which they would seek protection of the law, had they any confidence in its administration. That, however, they cannot have; and considering how long the law has been administered by the class of landlords, it is no wonder that they should also deem it the

ally of their oppressors, and view it with a like enmity and distrust. However purely administered, it cannot be expected that the peasant should confide in its impartiality, or deem himself secure of justice. There ought, therefore, on this account, as well as for providing a really more efficient and just administration, to be no hesitation in superseding altogether, in Ireland, the Justices of the Peace, and substituting county and district Judges, such as the Sheriffs and Sheriff-substitutes of Scotland, with their accessory Procurators-fiscal or public prosecutors. In no part of the empire is justice, whether in matters civil or criminal, distributed more speedily, more cheaply, and more satisfactorily, to the mass of the population than it is in Scotland by these judges. Unbounded confidence is reposed in their impartiality. The poorest man knows, and is convinced that, against the richest and most powerful, he will obtain justice; while crime is followed up, detected, and punished, with a degree of certainty unknown in any other part of the three kingdoms. We doubt not that an experience of a very few years of the working of a similar system in Ireland would create a like confidence and security on the part of the population at large; and if this were once attained, a blow would be given to the practice of private vengeance as a means of redress, which would ultimately issue in its total suppression.

Along with this, the efficiency of such a system, in repressing crime, would provide that security to life and property which is essential to the employment of British capital in making the many sources of wealth and employment in Ireland available. The beginning of a new order of things would be made, and by the time the temporary interferences with property, and with the proprietor's free management of his estates, which have been recommended above, came to an end, channels of natural employment would have been opened up, habits of exertion and industry would have been formed, and such progress would have been made, in elevating the condition of the population, as to hold out a prospect of prosperity and peace to that long distracted and misused land.

Although in the preceding remarks we have not referred to the religion of the Irish population, we, of course, cannot but look on it as a main cause of their present degraded condition. The Legislature, however, can do little directly towards promoting a sound faith; and the utmost we could look for at their hand would be to refrain from positively encouraging Popery, and to open up a free field for the enterprise of private Christians, or Christian Churches.

As to the encouragement of Popery, we know that the en-

dowment of the Irish priesthood is a favourite part of the expediency policy of our leading statesmen of all sides, who look upon religion, and the ministers of religion, as fitting instruments of political rule, and are infatuated enough to suppose that, by paying the priests, they would purchase their services and their influence with the people, and that that influence would be worth the price. A few months ago, we should have thought it necessary to have entered somewhat at large on this subject, and to have warned our readers to be up and doing in resisting the proposition of Popish endowment. We incline now to hope that the proceedings at the elections in Yorkshire and Devonshire, have determined the Government to postpone, at least, their meditated attempt; and while, rejoicing at this, we refrain from any discussion of the question, we would still urge on the Protestants of the empire the duty of being prepared to take the field, if necessary, at a moment's warning. We must also earnestly point to the continued existence of the Church of Ireland, as creating the great, and we might indeed say, the only real danger of the endowment of the Romish priesthood being ultimately effected. That measure will never, we believe, be carried against the combined and determined opposition of all classes of Dissenters, unless through the acquiescence and support of the Church of England. The maintenance of the Irish Church, however, is such a gross and indefensible injustice, that nothing can permanently save it except the enlisting in a common support of endowments the great mass of the population of Ireland. Many friends of the Church of England, therefore, convinced of this, seek, with a lamentable sacrifice of the cause of truth to that of Establishments, to satisfy their brethren that the interests of the Church of England—sure to be shaken by the overthrow of that of Ireland—demand that they should submit to the endowment of Popery there, in order to maintain the Irish Church in existence, at least, if not in the uncurtailed possession of all her present endowments. As yet, this view does not generally prevail; but it will doubtless spread, and if it do, may urge upon us the attempt of effecting, on the earliest possible opportunity, the overthrow of the Irish Church. All danger of the endowment of Romanism would, in this way, be for ever averted;—a great barrier to the spread of the truth of the Gospel among the native Irish would be removed; and an opportunity would be afforded for ample provision being made for the support of hospitals, asylums, &c., for the blind, dumb, insane, and impotent poor, or for advancing the general prosperity of the kingdom by useful works of public advantage, when any temporary rate for such objects may have come to an end.

We had contemplated noticing some other of the more important matters likely to come under the consideration of Parliament this session, but our space does not admit of our doing so. If, however, even those which we have adverted to be well disposed of, the country will not have, on this occasion, again to complain of a session barren of results for the benefit of the people.

INDEX

INDEX

TO THE

TENTH VOLUME OF THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

A

- Anderson, Dr., editor of the *British Poets*, patronized Thomas Campbell, 477.
 Argyll, Duke of, his *Essay on Ecclesiastical History of Scotland* reviewed, 424; *see* *Ecclesiastical History*.
 Argyll, rebellion of the Earl of, 328—his execution, 399.
 Armament, reduction of, 515.
 Arnold, Dr., his views on the relation between Church and State, 435, 457.
 Ateliers Nationaux organized by M. Marie, 274—difficulty in finding work, 275—schemes of M. Emile Thomas, 275—their dissolution, 289.
 Austria, its embarrassments—inability to resist the demands for a central government, 255.

B

- Barré, Colonel Isaac, his claims to be considered the author of *Junius' Letters*, 105.
 Baxter, Richard, trial of, by Jeffreys, 393.
 Beattie, William, M.D., his "*Life and Letters of Thomas Campbell*" reviewed, 459.
 Bishops, their resistance to the measures of James II. and victory, 416.
 Boethius' work, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, translated by Chaucer, 315—character of the book, 316.
 Brandt, John, Esq., the Mohawk chief, his correspondence with Thomas Campbell, 495.
 Britton, John, F.S.A., his work, "*Authorship of the Letters of Junius Elucidated*," reviewed, 97.
 Brougham, Lord, his opinion of Castlereagh, 221.
 Burke's opinion of Junius, 103.

C

- Cabal Ministry, character of the members of, 378.
 Campbell, Thomas, *Life and Letters of*, 459

—his pedigree, 460—character of his father, 462—an evening at Mr. Campbell's, 463—school and college days, 464—his politics, 466—walk from Glasgow to Edinburgh—Gerfald's trial, 467—domestic tutor at Mull, 469—translations from *Æschylus* and *Aristophanes*, 471—*Elegy* written in Mull, 472—traditions of Mull, 473—the *Western Islands*—"Pilgrim of Glencoe," 475—his connexion with Dr. Anderson—the *Dirge of Wallace*, 477—circumstances under which "*The Pleasures of Hope*" was first published, 479—feud with Leyden, 479—Campbell, Goldsmith, and Darwin compared, 481—visit to Klopstock—scenery near Ratisbon, 483—the "*Mariners of England*"—the "*Exile of Erin*," 485—life of an Irish patriot in the Tower, 487—Campbell's poverty, 487—marriage—early married life, 488—Campbell's pension—day with Fox, 491—"Gertrude"—Chateaubriand's "*Atala*," 493—correspondence with the Mohawk chief, 495—"O'Connor's Child," 495—London University—Lord Rector of Glasgow University, 497—tranquil death, 499—Westminster Abbey, 500.
 Castlereagh Papers, causes which have tended to obscure our notions of Lord Castlereagh's character, 216—materials for his biography, 217—his early life, 217—rapid

ugh:

powers, 221—opinion of Mr. Wilberforce, 222—testimonies of contemporaries, 223—his connexion with the *Legislative Union* between Great Britain and Ireland, 224—early suggestion of the *Union*, 225—had ever Ireland a *Parliament*? 226—Irish progress, 227—the *Scotch and Irish Unions*, 229—memoir of *State prisoners*—misprints, 231—*United Irishmen*, 231—organization of the *Secret Society*, 232

- the executive, 235.—Tone's reception at the Luxembourg, 237.—Jean Bon St. André at Tunis, 239.
- Central Government of Germany, need of, 257—weakness of, 258—benefits to be expected—obstacles to be overcome, 259.
- Chaplains in 1685, treatment of, in the house of a country squire, 391.
- Charles I. and II., character of, by Mr. Macaulay, 376, 378.
- Chaucer, distant and misty reverence with which we are accustomed to regard this first of our native poets, 293—marketable value of Chaucer—influence of his writings on our literature, 294—features of dissimilarity alone brought out by our historians, 295—much has been done in later times to bridge the gulf which separates us from our ancestors, 296—recent works on Chaucer—Mr. Cowden Clarke, 297—Mr. Saunders' "Pictures of English Life," 297—Memoir by Sir Harris Nicolas, 298—his Norman origin—Battel Abbey Roll, 299—his studies, 301—was he a soldier?—his marriage, 303—his foreign missions, 305—his "Custom-house reckonings"—his pitcher of wine, 307—his "cyntrie purse," 309—another pitcher—his death, 311—his family—"Lytel Lowys," 313—he was the expression of his time, 314—his philosophical attainments—translator of Boethius, 316—the "Testament of Love," 317—his position with regard to the Reformers, 319—his supposed friendship with Wycliffe, 321—very few grammatical changes in the English language to be attributed to the Norman Conquest, 322—Chaucer's language, 323—his rank among our poets, 325—essentially the poet of man, 326—his love for external nature, 327—resembles Goethe more than any of the poets of our own country, 327.
- Church and State, Noel's essay on the Union of, 350—the question gradually narrowing itself within very small compass, 350—combatants on both sides approximating each other, 350—peculiar perils attending the Union, 351—religion a fair subject for legislation, but not the Church, 352—circumstances under which this Essay issues from the press, 353—estimable character of the author, 353—what the Union condemned by Mr. Noel is, 355—the duty and character of the State confounded, 357—Mr. Noel's leanings to the congregational system of Church polity, 359—meaning and application of the term "Church," 359—probable effect of Mr. Noel's example on the minds of his former brethren, 360—effects of the Union, 361—influence upon Bishops—the pious Anglican pastor, 363—the actual state of the English Establishment, 364—Mr. Noel's concluding address, 364.
- Church of Rome, Historical Foundation of, 39—sources of information, the authorized expositions of the Romish faith, 41—Council of Trent—"Professio Fidei," 41—"Catechismus Romanus," 42—the Office and the Occupant, 43—alleged Scriptural authorities, 45—Antiochian and Roman Episcopacy of St. Peter, 47—date of his first Epistle, 49—testimony of the early Fathers, 51—Onuphrius Panvinus, 53—the Gospel of St. Mark, written at Babylon, 55—date of St. Peter's first sojourn at Rome, 55—St. Paul's journeys to Rome, 57—memorials of the early Martyrs, 59—St. Peter's Roman Episcopacy a pure fiction, 61—origin of the tradition, 61—shameful interpolation of the works of Cyprian, 63—origin of the Christian community at Rome, 65—conflicts of Bishops—decisions of the Bishop of Rome disregarded, 67.
- Church principles, dangerous tendency of, 427.
- Churchill, Duke of Marlborough, character of, 394.
- Churchill, Lady, history and character of, 411.
- Clarke, Mr. Cowden, review of his "Tales of Chaucer," 297.
- Claverhouse, cruelties of, 397.
- Cobden, Mr., his scheme of Financial Reform, 513.
- Coleridge, S. T., intimate friend of Charles Lamb, 187, 213.
- Common sense, theory of, 158, 169.
- Communism in France, 265—distinct from Saint-Simonianism and Fourierism, 269.
- Confession of Faith, doctrine of, on the government of the Church, 440.
- Considérant, Victor, leader of the Fourierists in France, dedicated his *Destinée Sociale* to Louis-Philippe, 265.
- Critical and artistic eras never coincident, 86.
- Despatch of public business in Parliament, schemes for promoting, 506.
- Dieterici, Dr., his statistical notices valuable as contributions to the history of the Zollverein, 243.
- Dorset, Earl of, character and history of, 414.
- Dryden the poet becomes Papist, 409.

E

Ecclesiastical History of Scotland, Essay on, by the Duke of Argyll, 424—qualifications of the author, 425—original design—Spottiswoode Society, 425—merits of his "Letter to the Peers," 426—evils which result from admitting the sacerdotal theory of the nature and authority of "The Church," 427—present character and past history of Scottish Prelacy, 430—the Duke's leading positions, 435—

views of John Knox on the interference of civil rulers in ecclesiastical affairs, 435—historical origin of principles, 438—doctrine of the Confession of Faith on the government of the Church, 440—Westminster Assembly, 442—statement of the principles of the Free Church on the relation between the civil and ecclesiastical authority, 443—National and Divine right, 446—function of ecclesiastical office-bearers not priestly, 449—Protestant and Popish views, 450—Free Church Courts lay no claim to infallibility, 451—course of the general argument, 452—Headship of Christ, 453—the Duke's position, 456—Dr. Arnold's views, 457—strong desire on the part of politicians of the present day to subject churches to civil control, 458.

Edwards, President, his opinions on the Freedom of the Will examined, 173.

Eichhorn, K. F., has given the best account of the historical development of German society, 243.

Eliu, the most delightful section amongst Charles Lamb's prose works, 180, 194.

Emigration of persons educated at Ragged Schools, 36.

Emmett, Addis, his connexion with the Irish Rebellion, 233.

Established Church, maintenance of, one of the grand questions to be discussed in future Parliaments, 505.

Exclusion Bill, history of, 384.

F

Field, Rev. J., on the separate system of imprisonment, 27.

Fieldlane and Saffronhill, wretched receptacles of the poor in, 3.

Financial Reform must occupy the attention of Parliament, 512—Mr. Cobden's scheme, 513.

Fourierism, distinctive principles of, 264.

Francis, Sir Philip, his claims to be considered the author of Junius' Letters refuted, 119.

Frankfurt, representative Assembly of Germany at, 248.

Free Church, principles of, on the relation between civil and ecclesiastical authority, 443—does not, as the Duke of Argyll avers, seek to identify her Church Courts with Christ, 450.

Free-will, views of Reid, Stewart, and Hamilton regarding, 172—argument of the modern Necessarians, 175.

Game's Up, the, pamphlet by Menenius, reviewed, 226.

Gerald's Trial, Thomas Campbell's account of, 467.

Germany: its state and prospects, 240—character and importance of the German Revolution, inadequately appreciated by

the mass of English political writers, 240—sudden and unexpected changes between the beginning of March and the end of August, 241—great social movement in Germany, calculated to affect not only that country itself, but its relations to the rest of the civilized world, 242—sources of information—Eichhorn—Dieterici, 243—M. Bassermann's notice of motion in the Baden Second Chamber, on 12th February last, 243—popular meetings to promote the representation of the German people in the Frankfurt Diet, 244—their results, 245—first efforts at concentration, 247—Constitution of the Vor-Parlament, the Archduke John's election as Vicar of the Empire, 251—organization of his Government, 251—weakness of the Central Government, 253—disposition and comparative power of Austria and Prussia to oppose, and of central Germany to promote a central government, 254—embarrassments of Austria, 255—condition of Prussia, 255—need of a central government, 257—benefits to be expected—obstacles to be overcome, 259.

"Gertrude of Wyoming," the most elaborate and the most beautiful of Campbell's works, 492.

Goethe and Chaucer, resemblance between, 327.

Goldsmith's style compared with Campbell's, 481.

H

Hamilton, Sir William, his Notes and Dissertations on the Works of Dr. Reid reviewed, 144—this volume the most important contribution to the metaphysical literature of Great Britain that has appeared in the nineteenth century, 144—estimate of Dr. Reid's philosophy in Europe and America, 144—influencing motives to intellectual exertion, 146—development of the scientific faculty, 148—enormous accumulation of the materials of exact learning and historical research evinced in Sir William Hamilton's volume, 150—current philosophical literature, 151—his Notes and Dissertations characterized by the peculiar nomenclature and terminology of the language, 152—effects of condensed generalization, 153—materials proper to philosophy contained in the work, 153—Letters of Dr. Reid, 154—early history of Reid, 155—epoch of Reid and Kant, 157—Sir William Hamilton's philosophy, a fusion of the spirit and doctrines of Reid and Kant, 157—three central ideas of the new Scottish philosophy, 158—the question-putting tendency, 159—the ideal theory, 160—refined hypothesis of representation, 163—mediate and immediate knowledge, 165—first principles of

- metaphysics, 167—theory of "Common Sense," 169—new form of religious scepticism, 170—the doctrine of Free-will, 172—argument of the modern Necessarians, 175—our obligations to the author of the Notes and Dissertations, 177.
- Hazlitt, intimate friend of Charles Lamb—his literary merits, 191.
- Highwaymen in 1685, description of, 390.
- Historian of Rome, qualifications necessary for, 341.

I

- Ideal theory, 161—refined hypothesis of representation, 163.
- India House, life of a clerk in, 188—generosity of the East India Company to Charles Lamb and his sister, 212.
- Ireland, remedial measures for, 529—endowment of Popery in, 535.
- Jeffreys, Sir George, his fiendish character, 392—exhibits his brutality at the trial of Richard Baxter, 392—accumulates a fortune from ransom money, 402—public exultation at his ignominious death, 420.
- Jesuits, picture of the, by Mr. Macaulay, 407.
- John, Archduke, appointed Vicar of the Empire, 251.
- Junius' Letters, Authorship of, elucidated by John Britton, 97—remarks on the character of Junius, 98—public anxiety to give life to his shade not yet abated, 99—charges of malignity and personality brought against him, 100—Junius as seen in his genuine letters, 101—circumstances under which the letters were written, 102—Burke and Lord North on Junius, 103—list of persons named as the authors of the Letters, 105, *note*—Mr. Britton attempts to identify with Junius, Colonel Isaac Barré—object of his work, 105—Sir R. Phillip's interview with the Marquis of Lansdowne, 106—letter to a Brigadier-General, 109—duel between General Townshend and Lord Albemarle, 111—Miscellaneous Letters—Barré's offices and pension, 113—his talents not equal to those of Junius, 115—Barré had no ground for hating the Scotch, 116—why did he, if Junius, cease to write? 116—claims of Sir Philip Francis rejected, 119—claims of Lord George Sackville refuted, 124—claims of Colonel Lauchlin Maclean, 130—his parentage and education, 131—attack upon General Townshend, 133—Maclean Lord Shelburne's private secretary, 135—Lord Shelburne acquainted with what passed at Court, 137—Junius ceases to write—Maclean goes to India, 139—is lost in the Swallow packet in 1777, 141—objections answered, 141—conclusion, 143.
- Juvenile Criminals, 1—picture of the back settlements of Westminster, regions of Fieldlane and Saffronhill, 3—uprising and occupations of London Juveniles, 4—Ragged School scenes, 5—dens of misery in Glasgow and Liverpool, 6—a home to the poor man, 7—lodging-houses, 8—gradations of rank among thieves, 9—"fences" gains of a thief, 11—Prison discipline, separate system, silent system, 13—absurd notions current as to the separate system, 15—horror of prisoners at absolute isolation, 17—the assertion that the separate system is inconsistent with wealth and tends to promote insanity disproved, 18—juvenile ward the most corrupt, 19—questionable discipline proposed for juveniles at Perth Penitentiary, 21—luxuries—criminals better treated than the honest, 23—a comfortable subsistence the reward of crime, 25—effects of compulsory industry in prison, 27—moderate whipping for juvenile delinquents, 29—measures of relief must be sought without the prison walls in the amelioration of the swarming masses from whom our criminals are drawn, 30—proposal to compel the parent to pay for the child in prison, 32—influence of sanitary improvement upon the moral nature of man, 32—education, 33—houses of refuge after punishment, 35—emigration—Ragged Schools, 36.

K

- Kant, Immanuel, first principles of his Philosophy, 157.
- Keats, Life of, by R. M. Milnes, 69—connexion between the genius of Keats and his constitutional malady, 70—premonitions, 71—the poetical character, 73—the Charmian Fever, 75—the transitional state of Keats' mind, 77—rising to a higher region of existence, 79—laborious introspection constantly exercised by the mind of Keats, 81—his own judgment of his powers and their products, 83—external events of his history, 84—the great event of his life, the love-affair, 85—closing scenes of Keats' life, 86—peculiarities of Keats' school of modern poetry, the sensual and unconscious, 86—the critical and artistic eras, 87—"Ode to Apollo," 88—Ode by Thomas Taylor, 92—faults of the sensual school, 92—"Remains" of Keats—Otho the Great, 93—"The Cap and Bells," 94—Sonnet on the Sea, 95—merits of Mr. Milnes' work, 96.
- Kineaid, Captain, his opinions on the separate system of Prison Discipline, 21.
- Knox, John, his views on the interference of civil rulers in ecclesiastical matters, 435.

L

- Labour, Organization of, a convenient watchword under which to unite the different parties striving to promote the co-operative principle, 271.—The principle of the Right to Labour recognised by the Decrees of the Provisional Government in France, 273.—debate on, in the National Assembly, 291.
- Lamb, Charles, and his friends, 179—some authors attract by means of their repulsion, 179—the advantage of sympathy with your author, 181—the sweetness of submission, 183—the family of the Lambs, 184—fearful calamity in the death of his mother—his devotion to his sister, 187—*opera omnia* of Lamb in the India House, 188—his hours of leisure, 189—"Popular Fallacies"—advantages of lamp-light over sun-light, 190—Hazlitt, 191—interruption in his literary pursuits, 193—his insensibility to music, 195—Southey's *Joan of Arc*, 197—faith and enthusiasm of Joanna, 199—the epitaph of Piron, 201—Lamb's puns, 202—inconveniences of stammering, 203—a literary poisoner, 204—the sociality of the Lambs, 206—supposed examination by a literary committee, 209—neglected authors won the sympathy of Lamb, 211—his character and life struggle impress many traces of themselves upon his writings, 211—his religious views, 212.
- Lansdowne, Marquis of, knew who Junius was, 106.
- Lieber, Francis, biographer of Niebuhr, 330, *note*.
- Locke, defective basis of his philosophy, 157.
- Lodging-houses, description of, by a convicted thief, 8.
- London University principally indebted to Thomas Campbell for its origination and success, 497.

M

- Macaulay's History of England, 367—close relation of the events of the reign of James II. to those of the present day, 367—dangers from the endowment of Popery, 369—Popery not favourable to civilisation, 371—government of the Priest and of the Baron, 372—Popery and Mahometanism compared, 373—relation of the nobility to the commonalty at an early period, 374—Popery, Episcopacy, and Puritanism, 375—character of Charles I. and his advisers, 376—attempt to force the Liturgy on Scotland, 377—character of Charles II., and the members of the *Cabal* Ministry, 378—character of William, Prince of Orange, 381, 409—of Halifax and Sunderland, 383—Exclusion Bill, 384—Whigs persecuted—Rye-House Plot, 385—scene at

the death of Charles II., 387—Statistics, and state of Literature and Science in 1685, 389—portraits of the mounted highwaymen, domestic chaplains, and parochial clergy, 390—character of Judge Jeffreys, 393—character of Churchill, afterwards Duke of Marlborough, 394—trial of Richard Baxter—cruelties of Claverhouse, 397—execution of the Earl of Argyll, 399—execution and burial of Monmouth, 400—butcheries in the West, 401—sale of pardons—burning of Elizabeth Gaunt, 403—general dissatisfaction with the King, 405—picture of the virtues and vices of the Jesuits, by Mr. Macaulay, 407—character and views of William, 408—conversion to Popery of Dryden, 409—character and history of Sarah Lady Churchill, 411—James attacks the privileges of Oxford, 413—Earl of Dorset described, 414—petition of the Seven Bishops—their trial and acquittal, 416—landing of William—flight of the King and Queen, 419—outburst of public vengeance on Jeffreys, 420—William and Mary declared King and Queen of England, 421—beauties of Mr. Macaulay's work, 421—a few blemishes noticed, 422—the moral and the warning suggested by the perusal, 423.

Maclaine, Colonel Lauchlin, has the best claim of any that has been put forward to be considered Junius, 131.

Martin, Montgomery, his "Ireland before and after the Union" reviewed, 215.

Metaphysics, importance of studying the first principles of, 167.

Milnes, R. M., his "Life of Keats," 69.

Monmouth, parentage of the Duke of, 384—execution of, 400.

Mull, life of the poet Campbell in, 469.

N

National Debt, proposal to pay off the, 520. Necessarians, modern, their arguments examined, 175.

Nicolas, Sir Harris, review of his *Memoir of Chaueur*, 293.

Niebuhr, Barthold George, the founder of a new dynasty of Roman historians, 329—his early education—aptitude for the acquirement of languages, 331—studies at Hamburg and Kiel, 333—residence in Edinburgh, 334—in the Danish and Prussian service, 335—historical qualifications—extraordinary memory, 337—extensive knowledge of languages, 338—his historical tendency, 341—his politics, 342—his friends, 343—literary history of his Lectures, 344—value of Dr. Schnitz's services, 347—incompetency of the new Translators, 347.

Niebuhr, Carstu, the traveller, account of, 239.

Noel, Baptist Wriothlesley, probable effect

of his secession in the minds of his former brethren in the Establishment, 360.
See Church and State.
 North, Lord, his opinion of Junius, 103.

Oxford, James II. attacks the privileges of the University of, 413.

P

Pardons, sale of, by James II. and Jeffreys, 403.

Parties, state of, in Parliament of 1849, 501.
 Perth Penitentiary, discipline pursued in, 20.

Peter, St., was he ever at Rome? 39.

"Pleasures of Hope," circumstances under which the poem was first published, 479—its success, 481.

Poetry, sensual and self-conscious school of, represented by Keats, 86.

Popery, dangers from the endowment of, 369—opposed to civilisation, 371—compared with Mahometanism, 373.

"Popular Fallacies," Lamb's, 190.

Prelacy, Scottish, present character and past history of, 430.

Prison discipline in America, 15—in Perth Penitentiary, 20.

Property, Right of, Proudhon's doctrine regarding the, 234.

Prospects of the Session of Parliament, 1849, 501—cannot pass over in the same manner as the last, 501—state of parties, 503—maintenance of the Established Church one of the grand questions, 505—schemes for promoting the despatch of public business, 506—"one hour rule"—"la clôture," 507—increased consideration on the part of members, 509—judicious distribution of business between the two Houses, 511—Financial Reform—Mr. Cobden's scheme, 513—reduction of armament, 515—large armament not necessary for our protection, 515—national debt, 518—condition of Ireland, 521—Irish Poor Law, 523—its natural tendency, 526—remedial measures for Ireland, 529—abolition of tenancy at will, 532—change necessary in the administration of the law, 533—endowment of Popery, 535.

Proudhon, P. J., early life and writings of, 282—his amazing powers of speech and writing, 283—his heresies more subversive of the fabric of society than the speculations of all other writers put together, 283—his formula "Property is Robbery," 287—introduced as the devil in the theatres of Paris, 292—the existence of such a man is no jest in Europe, 292.

Prussia, its position in regard to the central government, 286.

Pun making aided by stammering, 202.

R

Ragged School scenes, 5.

Reid, Dr. Thomas. *See* Hamilton, Sir William.

Religion a fair subject for legislation, but not the Church, 352.

Religious scepticism, new form of, 171.

Republicans, political and social, in France, 263.

Revolution, German, character and importance of, 240.

Roman Catholic Church, foundation of the, historically considered, 39.

Roman History, Niebuhr's. *See* Niebuhr.

Rousseau, Babeuf and Cabet, leaders of the Communists in France, 267.

Sacerdotal theory of the nature and authority of the Church, 427.

Sackville, Lord, has no claim to be considered Junius, 123.

Sanitary improvement, influence of, on the moral nature of man, 22.

Saunders, Mr., review of his "Pictures of English Life," 297.

Schmitz, Dr. Leonhard, excellence of his Roman History, 317—has conferred a signal service in securing to the world Niebuhr's Lectures, 345.

Scottish School of Philosophy, who the founder of? 145, *note*.

Secret Society of Ireland, account of the origin and objects of, 233.

Sensuality in the broader sense of the term, a characteristic of Keats' poems—sensuousness a characteristic of Milton's poetry, 72.

Shelburne, Lord, afterwards Marquis of Lansdowne. *See* Lansdowne.

Socialist party in France, 261—in effecting a revolution widely different objects in view by different parties, 262—political republicans and social republicans, 263—social speculations of Saint-Simon, 264—phalanxes of Fourier, 264—theories of the Communists, 265—Rousseau—Babeuf—Cabet, 267—picture of life in Cabet's work entitled *l'usage en l'air*, 268—the three systems though greatly differing in other respects agree in holding out an indefinite amelioration of the condition of the working-classes, 270—organization of labour—convenience of the name Socialists, 271—comparative strength of parties in the Provisional Government, 272—decrees of the Provisional Government contain the germ of the whole Revolution, 274—the Ateliers Nationaux organized by M. Marie, 274—schemes of M. Emile Thomas, 275—description of an Atelier National, 277—the Commission at the Luxembourg, 279—outburst of new opinion after the Revolution—Socialist clubs and newspapers,

281—early life and writings of P. J. Proudhon, 282—his opinions on the right of property, 282—his style of writing and thinking, 283—dangerous tendency of his opinions, 283—proportion of Socialists in the National Assembly, 283—sullen discontent among them—outbreak, 283—dissolution of the *Ateliers Nationaux*, 289—insurrection of June, 289—debate on the Right to Labour, 291—defeat of the Socialists, 291—farceical representations of the Socialists in the Paris theatres, 292.
 Southey's epic poem, "*Joan of Arc*," character of, 197.
 Spottiswoode Society, constitution and objects of, 125.
 Stein, Von, the collected memorials of, exhibit the rise and progress of the German yearnings after unity, 213.
 Saint-Simonianism, its origin and aims, 261.

T

Talfourd, T. N., his "*Memorials of Charles Lamb*" reviewed, 179.
 "*Testament of Love*," by Chaucer, a complete embodiment of the practical philosophy of the chivalrous ages, 317.
 Thieves, gradations of rank among, 9—account of an expedition of two, 11.

Thomas, M. Emile, his schemes for organizing the workmen in the *Ateliers Nationaux*, 275.
 Tonic's reception at the Luxembourg, 287.
 Tower of London, life of a State prisoner in the, 187.
 Townshend, General, the satirical attack upon, ascribed to Junius, 110.

U

United Irishmen, confederacy of, 231.
 Union of Ireland with Great Britain, early suggestion of, 225—advantages of, 227—Lord Castlereagh's connexion with, 225.
 Union of Church and State. See Church and State.

V

Vor-Parlament, meetings of, at Frankfurt, 219.

W

William, Prince of Orange, character of, 381.
 Woodfall, H. S., printer of *Junius' Letters*, 102—prosecuted for libel, 107.
 Wychok, supposed to have been acquainted with Chaucer, 321.

